PC/BOCC WORKSESSION
PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES TO COMP PLAN
THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 2003

PSC Building
1300 Franklin Street
BOCC Hearing Room, 6th Floor
Vancouver, WA
6:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

PRIDEMORE: Good evening, everybody. It looks like all of the really important people are here already and I understand Mr. Wriston will be in later. So I have had two requests. One is that we not speak too quickly, and, two, is that we not all speak at the same time so we can get this recorded for posterity. Why don't we go ahead -- I think everybody knows each other, but why don't we go ahead and introduce for anybody in the audience who might not know us. I'm Craig Pridemore, Chair of the Board of County Commissioners.

ROLL CALL & INTRODUCTIONS

LEIN: I'm Vaughn Lein, Chair of the Clark County Planning Commission.

PRIDEMORE: Go ahead, Sonja.

WISER: I'm Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant with Development Services.

LEE: Pat Lee, Long-Range Planning Manager, Community Development Department.

MOSS: Lonnie Moss, Planning Commission.

STANTON: Judie Stanton, County Commissioner.

BARCA: Ron Barca, Planning Commission.

SMITH: Carey Smith, Planning Commission.

MORRIS: Betty Sue Morris, Clark County Board of Commissioners.

DELEISSEGUES: Dick Deleissegues, Planning Commission.

RUPLEY: Jada Rupley, Planning Commission.

PRIDEMORE: Our purpose this evening is to start going through these issues that are lingering and trying to help select a preferred alternative. Our plan is to have a work session this evening. We have a work session similar next Thursday evening, joint, to go through these. The Board has a retreat scheduled on Friday, what's that date?

STANTON: The 20th.

LEE: The 20th.

PRIDEMORE: The 20th, where we'll talk through some of the remaining issues and then we have public hearings scheduled for --

LEE: The 23rd.

PRIDEMORE: -- the 23rd.

LEE: And a backup of July 1.

PRIDEMORE: And that will put us into the final phase for actual deliberations and focusing on developing the preferred alternative. The purpose of doing this joint workshop is to give you guys an opportunity to interact directly with us as we talk through some of the kind of global issues that are out there and would like to invite you and encourage you to please feel free to participate. This is the real opportunity to provide that input. Any comments anybody wanted to make to start us off? Mr. Chairman? Okay, then I'll turn it over to Pat to get us going.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSS

LEE: I had, you know, drafted up this agenda to sort of follow how we expect to proceed with the staff presentations. If there is anything else that folks would like us to address, you can let us know as we're going in. We have other staff here that can address other issues that may come up besides those that are itemized on the agenda packet.

The first item that I wanted to do is go through the staff report and make a few minor corrections. This is the June 12th, 2003 memo from me to the Clark County Board of Commissioners and Clark County Planning Commission. And as indicated on Page 1 "Background" this initially started as a five-year plan, and midstream legislation which changed, we no longer do five-year plans, we do seven-year reviews. So there are several sections in here where the five should be changed to seven. The first one appears on Page 2 down at the bottom where it says "State Law" under 1(a) calls for a seven. The second is on Page 3 under "Decision Factors/Policy Discussion." The third is on the following page, Number 1, "Fulfill legal requirements," and then something a little more substantive. On Page 4, on Number 1(a) about seven lines down there it says "Selection anywhere within the range is a policy option. Please see the discussion on page 6, number 4," it's actually Number 5, so that's a misreference, so it's Page 6 point 5 on that page.

Also something that I'm sure would get people excited if I didn't correct it, if you go down to "Validate or revise planning assumptions," under Number 2, go to 4, I talk in terms of a 75 percent, 25 percent attached/detached split and I think they should be changed around a bit. So it should be 75 detached, 25 attached. Also a clarification just to be aware of under "Employment density" we assumed industrial nine employees per gross acre. It's not net buildable, it's gross acre. And the same with observed is ten employees per gross industrial acre. I think those are the corrections that I wanted to bring to your attention.

The second thing that I wanted to briefly address before getting into some more detailed presentations from other staff about some of the more recent resource materials that we've developed, but really since the Board gave us the initial policy direction in 2001, we produced quite a volume of work, much but not all of which is before you. And that would include such things as the Section 215 report, clarify, Section 215 of the Growth Management Act. That was reviewed last summer and submitted to the Community Trade and Economic Development Department. There, of course, is the draft EIS that you all have and we've had work sessions on, but we did not send another copy of that along in the package but that certainly has a wealth of information. And then we get to some of the materials that are enclosed in this, including at least the summary of the comments that we've received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

We also this evening did put together the volume of the actual comments that we have received, and there are a few other comments besides just those on the draft EIS, but we thought they might be germane to this discussion, and all the comments are itemized in tabs so hopefully if there is a specific comment that you're interested in, we can quickly reference that and take a look at it. And other than that, I think with a lot of the discussion surrounding the importance of economic development and job creation in Clark County, I'd like to have Oliver talk a little bit about the draft economic development element which actually has gone -- before it got to this stage has gone through a fairly extensive process of certainly initiated with the CREDCs strategic plan. That was reviewed by a number of stakeholder groups over the winter and we've tried to digest that into the economic development element. And also attached to that is a shorter term strategy that staff has proposed of things that we could do to move that along. So if there is no objections, I'd like to have Oliver briefly review that.

ORJIAKO: I'm here.

LEE: Come on. Come on up. You're on.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT

ORJIAKO: That was quick to call me up here so I'm trying to get ready to say a few comments. As Pat indicated, whatever decision or direction that the Board gives us I think some of the items that Pat mentioned will provide some guidance in doing that. What I will briefly do, because the Board had a work session on this draft June 4th, Commissioner Pridemore wasn't there because he was on vacation, we've shared this information of this draft with the partners, and by that I mean the cities, and we've received a series of comments. Or this is stamped "draft" so the Board haven't adopted this, but this is a revision to our existing Chapter 7. And what I would like to do is just go briefly what is in that document and how we got there.

As Pat indicated, there have been one or two economic conferences that was held I believe two years ago or so, and then last year the Economic Development Council unveiled the organization local economic development strategy. And then about I think at the beginning of this year the Board went through a series of meetings with the stakeholders, and also the youth commission had their input, and all those efforts I incorporated in this element. In some cases we've tried to not be repetitious because some of the comments were very similar, everyone is calling for a strong economic climate in Clark County, and we've incorporated all of those comment and draft in this chapter. If this chapter is adopted it will replace the existing economic development element that we have. One of the key drawbacks in what we currently have is a lack of vision, economic vision, for Clark County in our present chapter. So if you go through the document, the first two pages of that document provide a list of the vision of these statements, if you will. At the Board work session there was some recognition that perhaps we need to summarize that and have a section that calls out what the vision is. We've tried to do that on page, what will be --

LEE: 13.

ORJIAKO: -- Page 13 of the document. And here what we're really focusing on is growing a high wage economy that creates jobs at a rate in excess of population growth, and also with the emphasis on emerging industrial clusters that have a significant knowledge based component, and in doing so encouraging and retaining our existing businesses and encouraging them to expand. And in addition to that, we want to focus on economic growth that will support or that is supported by a master plan and mixed use development in areas that we've identified as nodes of growth and also supporting with primary emphasis on infrastructure investments to support that economic development. That in a summary is the vision.

What are the key concepts in the plan. One is family wage jobs. The second is focus investments. The third is regulatory change. And the fourth is inter-jurisdictional cooperation. If we focus briefly on the key concept of family wage jobs, the emphasis here, the way this is drafted is to focus on knowledge based economy that creates family wage jobs. Not only that, the emphasis also is on encouraging existing family wage employers to stay and to expand. The second theme on focusing investment is to support a desired pattern of growth that we are seeking --

MORRIS: Excuse me, Oliver, I think a lot of us are trying to find the page where you're on, certainly we are, and Vaughn seems to be looking through.

LEIN: Page 7-14.

ORJIAKO: When I talk about the vision statement I was referring to Page --

LEIN: 7-13.

LEE: 7-13.

ORJIAKO: At the beginning of 7-13. I hope you have the correct copy. Okay. All right. And I'm just going through the major concept in the draft, I'm not referring to any page at this point. For the vision I referred to Page 7-13. For the focus investment the idea is to support the desired growth of pattern that we are seeking. And whether it's individually or collectively to focus infrastructure investment in the areas that have been identified through the focus public investment report which is in your packet. And the third theme is regulatory change. Here we are saying really that we have to be -- we have to do something to differentiate Clark County with other communities, because if we are going to be copying what have happened in other communities, eventually other communities are going to be copying what is happening elsewhere and it will probably make us less competitive so we have to move towards in the regulatory change arena moving towards developing some processes that will help us change or support shorter timelines, working towards the removing of environmental constraints and making some changes that are more predictable and more cost effectiveness. And the second or last concept that you'll find throughout the report is inter-jurisdictional cooperation. And here the emphasis is that we have to expand the opportunity and build partnership between the private sector and the public sector, and also between education and business, and that collectively a significant benefit can be gained through cooperation and diversity.

The other issue that we raised in the chapter is how will this all relate to the other elements of the comp plan. There have to be a relationship between the land use, the transportation and the capital facilities element if we are to make this work. And you will also find out throughout the document that relationship between how we moved the idea of the focus public investment or focusing on the node that we've identified, what type of land use changes need to occur to help that become a reality. And in addition to that, when you move to regulation changes, we're already beginning to make change or propose a change to draft a business park district which we will be sharing with the Board in a work session before the --

(Technical difficulties.)

PRIDEMORE: Is that a separate recording? All right. So we're fine but we won't be amplified. So if folks in the back can't hear, then raise your hand or something.

ORJIAKO: Yeah, moving on quickly. We've drafted a business park district and the emphasis there is to focus on those type of uses that came out as a result of the EDC economic development strategy more in the area of flex offices that you currently don't find in industrial district and other type of uses to facilitate some of the changes that we're proposing. In addition to that we've started a process on the e-permitting idea and also developing this system to 90-day permit timeline supportive of economic development. And we've also proposed -- in the area of regulatory change we've proposed a policy that is in here, and I will get to that quickly, on if the strategy is to bring in additional industrial land but more in terms of larger size, what instrument can we put in place to help us maintain those in large tract of land.

The other issue or relationship that we address here but briefly is schools and here we're talking about equity issues and physical concentrations. There have been a lot of discussion in this area but, as you know, there are about nine school districts in the county, some are in the rural area, so when you talk about equity through land use designation, that may be very difficult to do. So we -- while we address that, we felt that there may be a need at the State legislation for school funding issues rather than using a land use recommended to get there, but that's one element or one issue that we don't want to skip from discussion.

The next is cities. From some of the things that we've heard from the cities I think they're more concerned -- concentrating on their physical. From a physical perspective some of the issues that they raise one element you want to consider, I think Commissioner Betty Sue was involved in that and I think others, a few months ago there was a revenue round-table discussion on how to address some of these issues. We've addressed, we've not ignored that. We indeed -- if you go to Page 7-12 you will see some discussion on revenue sharing issues. It is one that we believe will not go away when we begin to talk about targeted regional investments of how you do that and then the industrial land bank issues. As we move into how we do the targeted regional investment and the industrial land banking, I think revenue issues will come back again, so it's just a recognition that that issue will continue to be with us.

The final relationship is in rural industrial land bank. On Page 7-14 you will find a policy, which is policy I, which includes a proposed language relating to the 2000 legislation on rural industrial land bank.

LEE: Near the top of the page on Page 7-14. It's in bold.

ORJIAKO: And it's in bold. The policy in a sense we've shared that with the cities, they raised some concerns, it's one that we will continue to work. The primary concern was last time we drafted that policy we made some of the shall we put it into "may" and their recommendation was that we change that. For example, if you go to the first line where it says "following consultation with interested cities, the county," when we drafted it it said the County "may," the cities suggest that we change that to "shall." Now there is some consideration that we go back to "may." And the final line where it says "appropriate or required interlocal agreement consistent with the provision of the state law shall accompany such designation," they would prefer that we leave that "shall" in. But, again, it's a work in progress. We will make those changes. If the Board concur, it will be the one that is adopted.

Now I will not go into that in terms of how this concept relates to the policies that have been drafted in this chapter. What I will say is that we've tried as much as we can to make sure that the goals and the policies that are in this chapter relates back to the key concept of family wage job, developing and concentrating on our focus public investment areas, and issues relating to the industrial land banking and revenue sharing issues. Briefly there are only eight goals. We tried to make it very short. Eight goals in the plan chapter. However, there are some policies under each goal. If you go to Page 7-15, Goal 7.1 touched upon family wage jobs. Page 7-16, Goal 7 --

LEE: Oliver, why don't you go to the policy itself since you look like you're referencing a different version than I am. So just cite the policy of the goal and we can get to the right page.

ORJIAKO: This is on Page 7-15, Goal 7.4. This one deals with emphasis on partnership between the public sector and the private sector, and as well as business and education. This is where we emphasize that. On Page 7-17, Goals 7.6 and 7.8.

LEE: That's on 16.

ORJIAKO: 16, excuse me, this was copied somehow differently, I got a different page, but Goal 7.6 and 7.8 on Page 7-16 emphasizes on partnership, on infrastructure and development and focusing on identified clusters which the region has a strategy advantage. One other thing that we did with this chapter is referring an action plan on how to implement this concept that we're talking about. It's only three pages and it is at the back of this document, if you can get to it quickly, and I will summarize what we're proposing here. Or what we've proposed.

LEE: It's called the Clark County Strategy and Action Plan, and so it's the last three pages --

ORJIAKO: The last three pages --

LEE: -- of the packet.

ORJIAKO: -- of this document. Here again, if you take the call for a strong economic climate, some of the issue will be, well, how do you or how will you improve the County's economic climate. What we've tried to do here was to focus on three key strategies that we believe if we undertake within the next five to ten years I think we'll be in good shape. Some of these, some of this action support one another so and you will find some of them repeating throughout the three pages.

Let me focus on the three key areas. One is preparing the identified nodes of growth for economic development. Second is reducing regulatory barriers. And finally increasing the County's capacity to support and participate in economic development. If you go to the first strategy, prepare specific nodes, that is the focus public investment areas for enhanced economic development. What we're really saying is that we need to do this, we have to create zoning designations, developer agreement, and other tools that protect designated areas of focus investment from fragmented type of growth. The second is to develop a wet bank for mitigation for our wet -- develop a wetlands mitigation bank within a year. Within a year to five years. And third, develop a process for pre-qualification of sites and have a process for encouraging landowners to use the pre-qualification.

When we talk about "pre-qualification," what we're really emphasizing is on working on ways to remove some of the environmental constraints and if that is done up front I think it will facilitate some of the things that we've stated, particularly how and when we develop the 60 to 90-day review process. That makes it much, much easier if we do those things up front. And then look at revisions for the -- to the concurrency program that protect trips for industrial and office uses. And also establish a discretionary fund for the County's use in economic development. I think on this particular one, as some of you are aware, the County has made the first step in the decision they made on how we use REET. Before REET, all goes to parks, now the Board made a decision that it be 50/50, so some of that could be used in some of the things that we're proposing.

The second strategy is this area of reducing regulatory barriers. Again, the emphasis here is to go into an action that would differentiate the County from other jurisdiction. It could be from the State when you talk about differentiation. It could be what would differentiate Clark County from Cowlitz County or Skamania or any other counties in Washington. Or even looking across the river. So we believe that developing the 90-day review process is one of that, developing the e-permitting also for assisting commercial and industrial growth is one of that, and amending our code, which we've already started to do, streamlining our code, that work is almost complete. And we also are emphasizing on rezoning some parcels. We had a discussion on this to that fact, rezoning some parcels out of industrial use if they are severely constrained by environment, adjacent land use or transportation, there will probably be some discussion on this as we go forward. And then again looking for revisions to the concurrency programs. The emphasis here is if there are those, we can protect trips for industrial land office uses and again using the pre-qualification of sites.

The final one is how to do this. We also need to increase the County capacity to support and participate in economic development. I spoke earlier about the decision the Board made on REET so we're saying establish a discretionary fund for the County's using economic development within the next one to five years, and then to grow that discretionary fund. Our concern is that the 10 million even if we mandate it is probably -- it may not be enough to do some of the things we would like to see happen. In making this presentation and working on this I don't pretend to be an expert in economic development issues, but we also are making a recommendation that there be a dedicated professional staff for economic development to implement the action plan. This is not taking away from EDC but we believe in it.

The other issue we raise is to develop land aggregation strategies. We talked about policy that would help us to amend our code to protect large industrial sites. We're also talking about aggregation of smaller lots. Those could be something that we can also end back on. And then working with the ports to expand port property to include sites suitable for targeted industries and high-tech firms, including lease and ownership. As you know now, the Port of Vancouver and some of the ports do not sell their property, they lease. And then to support the ports in joint countywide marketing efforts. And again, as I indicated, the 10 million may not be significant. We may have to investigate in other tools for the discretionary fund. A need could be tax increment financing. There have been some discussion at the legislature, we don't believe that, that the way it's looking now will be helpful. It could be, we could support amendment to that, and then B&O tax if the family chooses, and then revenue sharing and revenue pooling type of issues, which may require some new legislation. That's the theme and the strategy that we have in drafting this element. I will stop there and take any questions that you may have.

PRIDEMORE: Thank you, Oliver. And this is my fault for daring to go on vacation and missing a meeting, but there were several points there where you were talking about that we are recommending. Was that something that came out of the work session or is that something you guys, staff, is recommending such as the dedicated professional staff for economic development?

LEE: Yeah. The action plan is something that we developed as staff, we presented in work session, and recognizing that I guess there was two comments that I recall coming out of the work session, one that perhaps the cities should take a look at it and see how they might also collectively cooperate these types endeavors. For example, if there's, you know, some coalescence around some of these concepts, maybe each of the comp plans could put some of that language in there. And the other was that there, you know, there is some concern about, you know, being so focused on knowledge based because there can be family wage that you might not think of as strictly knowledge base. But I think the results of the work session was that the Commissioners felt comfortable getting these out in the public forum for discussion, recognizing that it's still in a draft form at this point.

PRIDEMORE: I just wanted to check on that since I missed the meeting.

MORRIS: And I think that there was a distinction between those parts of the strategy that are intended to be countywide and those parts of the strategy that are intended to be for the Clark County corporate entity itself, so that's why it's clearly labeled here as this. In fact I can't remember which page it is, but someplace in bold type it says from the rest, from here on out we meant it to be for the County.

PRIDEMORE: Dick Deleissegues, you were about to say something and I jumped right in.

DELEISSEGUES: Well, I had a question. Under reduce regulatory barriers what is e-permitting?

LEE: Use of -- right now people have to come in to our counter, put their application monies down, have them recorded, to the extent that we can do business through E-mail much like, you know, probably many of us have gotten airplane tickets or something like that on the Internet.

DELEISSEGUES: E-mail.

LEE: Just trying to make it easier for folks to, to not have to be in two places at once.

LEIN: Do you think we can issue a permit over E-mail?

ORJIAKO: Electronically it can be done.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, I think the idea is that you could do the application through E-mail. I mean obviously there's a whole lot more for the approval process.

MOSS: Vaughn and I want to be there to observe the first one.

PRIDEMORE: We'll get you a portable computer, Lonnie, and you could sit on the beach and submit your plans.

MOSS: That would be great. I'm hopeful. I'm all for it.

LEE: And as staff we're particularly interested in the application fee coming across somehow, which, you know, can be an auditing regulatory challenge.

PRIDEMORE: On our first issue, anything on the economic development strategy, you guys, it occurs to you that we should also address?

BARCA: I'm interested in the application of mixed use development. I see it as a really strong tool to be able to accomplish some of the residential requirements and piggyback them into the commercial zone also providing a certain amount of client base for the commercial applications, but I'm concerned on whether the mixed use definition falls into the Ridgefield spinned version of "mixed use" which is just concurrent uses as opposed to the one in which you have residential residing within the same commercial structure or something of that nature, and I'm wondering whether the County is looking at that mixed use version and going to be discussing a further clarification or modification of it?

LEE: I think that's something that could be done. One of the things that has occurred to staff, we have not generated anything as yet, but, for example, it might be worthwhile to take a look at what the mixed use regulations say now, see if that's achieving what we want, and if not, maybe pursue some changes to that. So I think we've thought about it. I can't say that we have any specific action in mind along the lines of the action strategy for the economic development plan at this point, but that is certainly something to look into, you know, if that is the wish of the Board to do so.

PRIDEMORE: It's something we've struggled with over the years is what actually do we mean by "mixed use." Certainly countywide we are a mixed use community.

BARCA: Certainly.

LEIN: Oliver, in the action plan you refer to a 90-day review process for projects of economic significance. What defines "economic significance"?

ORJIAKO: I think we will work those things out, it has not been defined whether we put a threshold as to whether we relate that to family wage jobs or to the amount of investments, or as we go back on this, those are the type of things that we'll be flushing out to finding it, what will constitute project of economic significant. If you take, for example, and this is just my own comment, if you take Legacy as an example, one could consider that as a development of economic significance if we are looking at attracting or keeping the health work entity that are currently committing a cost to develop, so that could -- I don't know how much they're investing in their project, but that could qualify as one. But we have not developed a threshold as to what we mean by that.

LEIN: My concern is if you're really trying to address some of the issues with small business, you're going to leave out small business if you start getting into too large dollar volumes there. And I have concern about that because the county's made up primarily of small businesses at this point.

ORJIAKO: We recognize that, yes, we'll work that out.

LEIN: Another question or a comment I have on Goal 7.4, Page 7-15, you talk about educational opportunities, but I don't really see anything here where you talk about working with the K-12 people in the county. To me this is going more towards the employee job training and higher end, and I got the impression from your presentation that you were really talking about cooperation with K-12 also.

ORJIAKO: That is the intent, yes.

PRIDEMORE: So you'd suggest that we add, just for the record, K-12?

LEIN: I'd like to see something in there.

ORJIAKO: I agree.

PRIDEMORE: Any other thoughts?

SMITH: Under the strategy increase capacity under (g) it indicates that we'll be looking into meaningful tax increment financing, B&O tax, revenue sharing and revenue pooling, which may require new state legislation. Are we prepared to be the petitioners of a proactive change in State law?

PRIDEMORE: It wouldn't be the first time.

MORRIS: That's true.

STANTON: That's right.

MORRIS: Clearly the Board has not even discussed advancing this B&O tax for counters. Right now we're not allowed to do it. And the only city in the county who actually imposes B&O tax, believe it or not, is Yacolt and the City of Vancouver is phasing theirs out rather than increasing it, but it is clearly an option that we might decide to pursue.

LEE: Yeah, everything here is at this point ideas being floated and this process is going to be leading to, okay, those things that we're going to pick up and run with and those that, you know, we'll have to deal with another time and not deal with at all.

BARCA: Can we discuss industrial land banking? I know that there are some constraints about what the County is actually able to do on land banking. Can anybody speak to what that is because I'm not exactly familiar.

MORRIS: I'm probably as familiar as anybody except Rich Lowry. Is Rich still here?

LEE: He's probably in the hearing's examiner hearing next door.

MORRIS: It's really clear. There are two parts of State law that allow for industrial land bank or industrial development outside of urban growth boundaries. One requires a specific applicant and has a minimum numbers of acres. And that's actually what happened at the Ridgefield Junction, and that was designated, first of all, and then Ridgefield moved their boundary out and annexed. The second is one that does not have a minimum lot size, minimum acreage size, does not require a specific applicant. The second one requires that the County participate with interested cities in developing cost and revenue sharing into interlocal agreements. And it's really very well-defined in State law, it's not like you can either curtail or expand the statutory authority of them. They're both in 36.70A somewhere.

ORJIAKO: That is 36.70A, Section 365 and Section 367. I don't have a copy, but those are the two sections.

LEE: And the limitation countywide is that there is two of these.

MORRIS: Two of the, right, of the second kind?

LEE: Yeah.

MORRIS: We can certainly make sure that you get copies of the statute, you can send those statutes to the Planning Commission.

PRIDEMORE: Is there a specific area about them that you're concerned about?

BARCA: I was wondering about a trigger mechanism as far as the rest of the inventory of industrial lands. Does a certain amount of land have to be consumed within urban areas before the industrial land bank can be tapped?

STANTON: No.

ORJIAKO: No.

BARCA: No. So it could be created and then immediately populated, which it sounded like was your first version where you already had a tenant in mind, or the second one could be creation and then perhaps funded for infrastructure and then immediately moved into application without worrying about what's going on in the rest of the county?

MORRIS: No, there's a requirement that there be no suitable similar land inside urban growth boundaries. But you know who's really well-versed on the second nonapplicant specific is Steve Stewart because he was the lobbyist for A Thousand Friends of Washington and was very supportive and very helpful when the legislation was advancing. So Steve could really -- I mean just speak with Steve for a while.

(Planning Commissioner Jeff Wriston entered the meeting.)

PRIDEMORE: Any additional comments? All right. So if anything else occurs to you on the economic development --

LEE: Right. One of the things that I hope to get, recognizing we have a follow-up work session next week, if there are some specific things that you would like us to provide for next meeting, and we're going to try and keep track of those, and, you know, make sure that we capture them at the end of the meeting today so that we can prepare ourselves to try and get you the information that you're requesting.

PRIDEMORE: Okay. So we'll move into focus public --

MORRIS: I had one question on the consumption and the employees per acre. And I need to find the specific pages, but somewhere in the DEIS it says that the industrial land consumption inside the city of Vancouver or maybe the Vancouver urban growth boundaries is 4 percent and 29 percent in La Center and Battle Ground. It's on Page 156 of the DEIS and I was just wondering if I was reading that right or if the figures were correct? It seems very little land inside the UGB.

LEE: What page number is that referring to?

MORRIS: My notes say Page 156. I would think there would have been more concern.

LEE: Projected job creation by employment sector and alternative, I don't see it on that specific page, but would that be something you'd want us to --

MORRIS: Please.

LEE: -- check out and bring back for the next meeting?

MORRIS: And I'll definitely find it, yeah.

PRIDEMORE: Any final comments? Then let's move on with focus public investment.

LEE: Okay. I think, as Oliver's presentation indicated, one of the strategies that we put forward is trying to identify some nodes and further, at least where staff is leading the dialogue at least, is if you feel comfortable with the idea of focus public investment. We have 17 of them that potentially have been identified. It is unlikely that we could go forward at the same time, so one of the things that may come out of this process is a prioritization of a few of these as perhaps the immediate focus of an industrial or economic development strategy as we come out of the comp plan. So that's kind of the backdrop for the discussion. And if, Derek, you want to change places here with Oliver and review that. And again, we've had some work session with the Board on this, but I think this is relatively new to the Planning Commission so we wanted to fill you in because we think it's a -- we think the report is a good report and provides a lot of information and certainly should be useful to the policy discussions.

CHISHOLM: I'll try to speak clearly.

LEE: And slowly.

CHISHOLM: And slowly. I'm thankful for the chance to address the group tonight, I don't think there's a bigger decision to be made in Clark County than for a selection of a preferred alternative.

LEE: Would it be helpful to do the light settings a little differently, maybe turn it down. There you go.

CHISHOLM: A number of you have heard part of this presentation already, to some of you it's completely brand-new. I think that Oliver set the stage very well in making it clear that economic development is not just a few platitudes and policy statements, we do intend to restructure some of the reprograms, some staff resources, some capital facilities planning, expressed permitting, development code standards and other things to make it more of a reality, and since tonight's conversation is principally focused on a geographic element, I'm going to try and take the economic development conversation into that direction so I'm not going to belabor you with a whole lot of bullet points and what this is all about and such.

The basic idea is that previously we have spent our capital facilities dollars and in a very broad fashion hoping to serve lots of different purposes. The methodology that led to those funding conclusions were very balanced with a lot of different principles at play and this is our attempt to make the new focus on jobs and family wage jobs more manifest on the ground level development and the planning that leads to that. And basically the idea is that previously we have sort of tried to fill all the potholes in the county a little bit at a time and instead what we're deciding to do now is to identify the potholes that if fixed are going to provide us the best benefit, fix those first, let the others stay completely unfixed until we get to their place in the prioritization. And so that prioritization is going to play out in your selection of a preferred alternative in that that preferred alternative will be comprised of a subset of the focus public investment areas and not the entire urban.

There are 17 focus public investment areas. They are both made up of existing and previous nodes of development such as the ports, the mall area, downtown, St. Johns. It's also going to be made up of some that are being proposed, Battle Ground, which it shows large there but is really comprised of three and possibly four different nodes of business park and commercial and industrial development, Ridgefield and La Center Junctions, the lower section of I-5, which is part of what was proposed to be the Discovery Corridor, as well as an expanded area around the originally conceived WSU Research Park which would now be referred to as an industrial park around the same spot. And then you can also see at the southern end of 117th or State Route 503 that there is a node and that expands outside of the urban growth area as well.

So what we did is we got together all of the engineers we could think of and we began to develop cost reports because we realize that there are a number of factors that were going to lead to your ability to make a decision about which focus public investment areas were most beneficial. Some of those are cultural factors, some of those are district equity factors, there are certainly political factors at play, but what you didn't have was a way of comparing the costs and the potential benefits in terms of acreage brought to a shovel ready status and/or the jobs that would be available at these different nodes.

So for each of these different areas the report breaks down the data as follows, and this is just an example of one. St. Johns corridor it begins with a basic introduction of the sites, location, nothing very exciting. The second paragraph is very interesting because it begins to pull out the existing parcelization that is there. And it's been made clear to us that one of the biggest reasons that we have for entertaining new industrial areas is the lackage, the lack of large parcels in some of the existing industrial areas. Underneath that you see some estimates of job capacities. Those are loosely based on the assumptions that have been the drivers for the entire comprehensive plan in terms of infrastructure and jobs per acre, but there was some professional judgment on the part of David Evans and Associates and their subcontractors in the determination of the jobs that could be generated from each of these sites. And then we just begin to walk through the infrastructure issues, concerns and costs, sewer, water, transportation, fire protection and emergency services, stormwater and environmental issues and electricity.

Some of those are pretty straight out public costs, some of those are straight public costs that the County's going to be expected to meet in many circumstances or the cities where the area would be developed, some of those are more on-site costs like stormwater and environmental mitigation. And we have provided all the tables at the back of the report which is on the Web and available very cheaply by CD so that any one of these areas can be studied by you. If you are wanting to become its champion or its opposition, what have you, you're able to look at it and see what breaks down the transportation costs, is there a State improvement in there that isn't really needed but would be good, is it legitimate to include the stormwater costs if those aren't a public costs, all of those tables are provided so that you can come to some of your own conclusions about these.

LEE: Actually for the benefit of the Planning Commissioners you do have an actual hard copy of the report in the mail-out package. And I know it got to you late, but it's there so you don't have to get the CD if you don't want.

RUPLEY: A low cost CD.

CHISHOLM: It's all about revenue so we have to pump the products (inaudible). The costs were generated by the engineers that were hired. We did exhaustive ground truthing of some of these figures in a way that we were not able to do so for comprehensive plan alternatives because basically people don't do site development based on thousands of acres of all kinds of different uses at a time, but there are people who are experts in telling you how much a road costs in a certain place under certain conditions and so we relied on those people to come up with the initial data, David Evans and Associates along with the staff then brought this data to the service providers for double-checks to the road engineers that are working for the different cities and counties for double-checks. So we're pretty confident that this is a pretty fair assessment.

In the back of the document you will see, obviously, some summary tables and I'll present a couple of these, I'm not an expert on any of these, and I'm certainly not an engineer, but just to give you a quick look. Excuse me. In the beginning of the appendix is Table A-5. It simply breaks down all of the focus public investment areas and all of the costs across the top, and then it has some additional notes on the side where other complicating factors may be an issue, perhaps it straddles two different service provision districts and there would be complications therein, or perhaps most of the jobs were considered from redeveloped land which is questionable compared to just straight calculation of jobs generated from vacant lands. At any rate, we weren't assuming that any of the tables that rank these upon any criteria is going to be the end of the debate; rather this report is meant to be at the beginning of the debate so that as you begin to identify which ones you think might be most important to include in the selection of a preferred alternative, you've got a wealth of information to draw upon.

This is an exciting part of it, I think, where we begin to represent it graphically. Obviously transportation is one of the biggest costs. Stormwater, as you can see, is second only to transportation, which though it's not completely a public cost that we would have to meet, it certainly is enough of a driver that should be included in ranking these and prioritizing them. Then obviously what it results in is an estimated cost per job. It's a very straight division. The costs are totaled, the jobs are totaled. The job estimates are also ones that you'll want to look at because we had to make some assumptions. Some areas are going to develop with distribution facilities, warehouses and traditional industrial uses that don't have a lot of jobs per acre. Other places are going to develop research and development firms, perhaps corporate headquarters, and would have many jobs per acre.

So this provides cost per jobs rankings, but if you don't feel that our assumptions about the number of jobs that would come off of each acre in each area is accurate, you can also refer to a table that simply breaks down the costs per acre for each of the sites and that gives you a different way of looking at it is that's neutral to the number of jobs that you get off of each one of them, though when you become familiar with some of the different nodes you can certainly see that some of them are headed towards a more industrial type of category and some of them would be headed towards corporate headquarter and office uses.

I think I've probably more than exhausted the amount of time I was hoping to take. I don't think that I can answer too many questions about this, but Pat's a big help, Oliver was certainly at play, and Laura Hudson with the City of Vancouver currently was the project manager with David Evans and Associates when we did this work and so she's also somewhat familiar with the data in here.

LEE: And she's here, I think.

PRIDEMORE: I had two questions, Derek. On the economic development chapter we talked about the need for parcels 75 acres and larger, but this report doesn't address those and it's just got 20 acres and larger. Is there an easy way to identify those larger acres?

CHISHOLM: Yes, we can do that.

PRIDEMORE: And then second, this is the discussion about CREDC or somebody who can deal with the market interest in specific areas, has there been any progress made on that? Are they working on it?

CHISHOLM: Pat might want to speak to that because he did make that request very formally to the CREDC (inaudible) neutral to site selection criteria and marketability. We have been (inaudible) collective criteria in these other documents in regards to that.

LEE: Okay. The feedback that I got from CREDC when I asked that question about what might be some of these locational or strategic consideration that firms may have in mind is in this big folder, DEIS COMMENTS AND ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, it's one of the additional comments, it is behind Tab 78, and they review -- well, they list and give a very brief explanation of what they think are important, distance to the Interstate highway system, access to major highways and arterials, cost and availability of shovel ready sites, proximity of similar types of industries and facilities, parcel size. And actually in this, in general the larger number of parcels greater than 10 acres attractive to this sector, the higher the rank.

So when you talk about large parcels there's different gradations of large parcels depending on so what is the vision of the employer that you have there that you're trying to recruit, but at least in this correspondence 10 is kind of a floor, time to occupancy, which kind of gets at some of the permit streamlining that we've discussed earlier, environmental constraints to development and strategic factors and a certain FPIA should be ranked higher than others because they support strategic economic development initiatives and targeted industries and they have come out with a list of targeted industries in there. So that is -- the correspondence from CREDC is behind Tab 78 in this big volume here.

PRIDEMORE: So in that they've identified factors but no --

LEE: They've identified factors, we have not applied those factors.

DELEISSEGUES: That's the cost criteria per jobs per acre, the highest that they've got listed?

LEE: They are certainly among the list of criteria that's of importance, yes.

DELEISSEGUES: So are a lot of other factors.

LEE: And again, you know, how any of the policy makers weigh what's most important in terms of the end objectives can very much play out in some of these land use designation decisions that we may be facing and that's why we wanted to make sure we presented this information to you tonight.

PRIDEMORE: I'm sorry, I was asking a question just about is somebody going to apply these factors and try to develop a ranking system in terms of market feasibility?

LEE: We can do that. Is that a request that you would like us to do that?

PRIDEMORE: Well, I'm sure it would be pretty difficult. I was kind of hoping CREDC, that was the information we would get from them, that they would actually look at the different areas and comment on the specific areas rather than just general. But I mean I --

LEE: Well, I was very happy to get the criteria from them myself because I do think it helps the discussion, but we can, would you like us to pursue that further?

PRIDEMORE: Will we still finish by the end of the year?

LEE: We'll finish by the end of the year.

STANTON: Commissioner, we were chatting, I'm sorry, were you asking about the kinds of jobs that an area would be able to attract?

PRIDEMORE: No. The report as we've got it now shows the cost per acre, cost per job kind of data, but the issue is the marketability of the property. You know, just because an area costs $1700 for a job doesn't mean that an industry is likely to want to purchase that in that particular area, I mean, so.

STANTON: So it's similar to the question that I have had to the EDC, and tried to ask it as well, and that would be considering the assets that are available in these different areas, what could you expect to attract to Battle Ground even though it's not close to I-5 for example. I would really like to know that too.

WRISTON: That's dicey to ask them to rank marketability.

PRIDEMORE: Who do we have I mean?

WRISTON: I mean that's -- I would just throw that out. I mean on an existing industrial development saying, well, you know, Bircher would be good for this and CTC would be good for that, I think that is a little --

STANTON: Well, I mean, wouldn't it be easy for them to say looking at for example industrial land in Battle Ground because it's not close to I-5, let me just use it as an example, it would be hard to attract a retail warehousing distribution center for example.

WRISTON: All that becomes public though.

STANTON: Wouldn't it be better for --

PRIDEMORE: What's your problem with that?

WRISTON: Well, I mean you're then pitting Battle Ground against Vancouver and you're pitting developments against developments. You're saying that CTC might do this and Bircher might do this and Battle Ground might do this and Camas might do this and Vancouver might do this. I mean who knows.

LEE: I hate to say it but I think there is a sense of competition that's already there.

WRISTON: There is a sense of competition. And I'm not saying it can't be done, I'm just saying it gets dicey because it, you know, it's like planning. I mean you're trying to put yourself into the developer shoes and/or into the corporation's shoes.

PRIDEMORE: I think the point I'm trying to get to is I don't want to put myself in those shoes, I would rather have them tell us that --

WRISTON: Well, but CREDC is not the corporate, the corporation or the developer or --

MORRIS: But a source might be a commercial real estate specialist in those cities. What you might find is a commercial real estate specialist in Battle Ground. And I don't know if there is one, but I know there are people who specialize in different areas in the county who might be able to take a look at the Battle Ground plans and say I think you really could attract --

STANTON: Attract.

MORRIS: -- these kinds of businesses here even though it isn't close to a freeway. And I don't know but I can understand why the CREDC might not want to get into the middle of that discussion.

PRIDEMORE: You're right because CREDC, the Board and the membership of CREDC is these developers. I mean those are the people who are going to --

WRISTON: You just want to get a little, yeah, you don't want to give a road map necessarily. I mean we want to have a road map, but you don't want to give because you want to be able to say that Clark County in all these areas are attractive.

PRIDEMORE: But the point is, the point is --

WRISTON: You know, that's where it gets dicey is, you know, you're --

STANTON: Except when you're trying to make focused public investments because you're not going to duplicate these same assets in another location.

PRIDEMORE: We are not likely to be able to fund the investments that we would like to make in all 17 of these areas. So the question is if we're going to really target our infrastructure investments which of these areas is best to do that. The staff has -- or staff and David Evans have a perspective that we get with this, but this does not specifically address the marketability or desirability of those particular areas to developers, that's what I'm trying to get.

WRISTON: Well, I have a comment. Existing, future, no problem, you know, it's the existing that worries me where you start to say here is what we have and we're going to add to this or add to that. I mean that's all I'm trying to say is that you've got existing industrial developments and you don't want to say one is more attractive. And this is cautioning, I'm not saying it's --

PRIDEMORE: So one is not to go out and make a whole lot of investments in an area that the marketplace is just not going to respond to, that's what I worry more about.

BARCA: And I think -- oh, excuse me.

MORRIS: But a part and parcel of that is are we going to make investments inside the Vancouver, I mean inside the Battle Ground UGB as a corporate entity, are there going to be other corporate entities like the City of Vancouver who are going to make focus public investment in the city of Battle Ground, is Battle Ground going to do focus public investment in the city of Vancouver. Or once this is finished focus public investment is highly dependent on each particular jurisdiction's own decisions. And so the County can solicit that kind of information for what appears to be a part of the County's individual economic development strategy, but it really is, I think, Battle Ground and those people who are specialists in Battle Ground who are going to be able to talk about what kind of job producers are going to go to Battle Ground more than it's going to be because I see Bryan Snodgrass actually agreeing with me on something so.

PRIDEMORE: Well, my thinking of this isn't to tell the cities what to do in this --

MORRIS: Right.

PRIDEMORE: -- but the reality is is even if you look at the Vancouver UGB, the majority of that that is developable for industrial is ours so that we have to have --

MORRIS: And I think that we can legitimately go to the commercial real estate market and say so inside the Vancouver UGB look at these and see what kind of industry can legitimately be attracted here. We may have gotten off on a discussion of what can go to Battle Ground because it's, I would think, pretty much Battle Ground's business of how they want to go about attracting that. At the point in which they come to us and ask us to participate in funding those targeted investment nodes inside the city of Battle Ground, then we would have a clear role to play in it.

LEE: I think, yeah, staff, staff has kind of wrestled with this issue as well and why we're, you know, soliciting some outside informed people to contribute to this discussion. The one other thing that I would say, though, it does kind of come back to this discussion of the land supply because we have proposals for a lot of industrial employment land expansion and it is the County's decision to set the UGBs.

MORRIS: Right. That's true.

LEE: Even if they're eventually annexed by the cities, which is the expectation, but we set that and the land use would go with it and so you'd want that to be as well-rounded a decision as possible as well.

MORRIS: But this came up to me when I was talking to the Battle Ground Chamber of Commerce. We established the urban growth boundary and certainly the City of Battle Ground has asked that those areas, and I believe that the City of Vancouver has asked, at least in some areas, that there be an urban holding over those new growth areas until they are annexed, and once they are annexed they may make different zoning decisions.

PRIDEMORE: Well, my understanding is that Battle Ground has actually gone further and said they don't lift until they annexed and they don't annex until they're developed. I mean that was --

MORRIS: I have never heard that before.

STANTON: I haven't heard that either.

MORRIS: No.

STANTON: That would mean who would develop it.

PRIDEMORE: There are some arguments, I mean we have a dedicated road fund specifically because we are the Road Commissioners, we develop roadways.

STANTON: County roads though.

PRIDEMORE: So just --

BARCA: But when it comes to the context of the number of nodes that has been identified, and knowing that we have a scarcity of resources to put that out, there are going to be specific areas that are going to be disadvantaged over the other as far as attracting these family wage type jobs that we're talking about. I believe for the ones that are on the bottom end of this competition it will be up to the individual municipalities to decide if they want to change their strategy to try and make themselves more attractive and do things different than they're doing now. If you're talking about Battle Ground as it exists today, the label of what type of jobs are readily available to go out there compared to what Battle Ground sees their own vision for, it's going to be a different vision than what today's label is that's being placed on it I believe.

So I think what we're really tasked with is picking those individual places that we see, as the CREDC said, has these additional compliments to it that make these particular nodes stand out, stand up above the rest of them. And I don't think it's necessarily going to fall into the dollars per job development cost, it's going to be those other attractive features that are going to have particular nodes rise to the top. When that happens that will, I think, help us focus on where those changes need to be on the map.

PRIDEMORE: But there's also going to be a finite amount of land that's going to get added to UGBs and this should inform some of the decisions about where those lands get placed as well. And that's not a decision that each individual city can make, that's a decision that we all have to make to accomplish a plan update. I mean that's, it's not just -- you know, each of the cities gets to do whatever they want, this is a comprehensive plan.

WRISTON: What I'm cautioning against and saying we need to be a little careful of this, in the last go-around we identified I believe three industrial nodes and we don't want to go back on those three industrial nodes. Or we identify three more and people are going to say I'm not going to, you know, you're just going to change that on me again five years down the road. I mean we identified I think three in East County and Ridgefield and the Port, is that the third? We had three industrial nodes I think we identified, I thought, in the last, correct me if I'm wrong, you're looking at me with a blank stare.

LEE: I don't know. Probably Oliver, he had to go, but Oliver would be familiar with the industrial nodes strategy more so than I am.

WRISTON: Well, we went through that.

LEE: But I know there was a series of industrial node reports that were created. Now what the implementation measures were beyond that I'm not familiar with at this point.

WRISTON: I thought we identified three. We got to be careful on making sure that we support those three or, you know, before we start, I mean, you know, before we go through this again and we lose credibility.

LEE: If I may as an action item perhaps at the next meeting try and chase down the history of that. Would that be helpful?

STANTON: That would be good. I'm remembering town centers and that kind of thing --

WRISTON: No, industrial nodes.

STANTON: -- but I'm not remembering industrial nodes.

MORRIS: I remember a discussion about industrial nodes too. Jerri Bohard talked a lot about industrial nodes and development.

WRISTON: Yeah. CTC was one, Ridgefield was one, and I think the Port of Vancouver was the other.

MORRIS: But again my question is: Are they not developed?

WRISTON: Yeah, they have quite a bit. In our current economic situation they have quite a bit, yeah, they have. The Port of Vancouver has done a great job and is expanding, and CTC as well, and everyone knows about Ridgefield. So, yeah, they're doing well, just got to be careful.

BARCA: So what more support would you expect?

WRISTON: What?

BARCA: What more support would you expect?

WRISTON: Well, I'm just saying we got to be careful and not in balancing that identifying more nodes or saying that these nodes we were wrong and this node is a better node or, you know, those types of things. We got to be consistent and careful or we'll lose credibility.

BARCA: But as a node develops, if the viability for development is going to change as well and as it matures, other sites will take a precedent that the other ones no longer have. If you've lost your larger parcels and new nodes come on that are more attractive in the current economy, then indeed I would see that those would then take the spotlight or move ahead.

WRISTON: They were identified originally because they had larger parcels and if you've lost some of those smaller, you know, the larger parcels to smaller parcels or whatever maybe, but it becomes the micro and the macro view and you want to take the macro view and look how are these, how, you know, how are they doing. I'm just cautioning us to make sure that we have identified. And I'm almost certain we've identified three industrial nodes in this county that we've identified in this last go-around and how are they doing and why, if, you know, and we can't judge. I mean are you doing well or not, I mean should we judge that, I don't know, but if are you growing as fast as we want you to grow. I mean you've got to look at the economic conditions and you got to re-examine all of this before we start moving ahead and saying, okay, let's do this over here and let's do that over there. It ticks the developers off, it starts to, you know, you're starting to open up a whole new industrial node and they've put their investments here and they're, you know, there's absorption.

PRIDEMORE: But I don't think they're --

WRISTON: So it goes, there's a long discussion to go with that I mean.

PRIDEMORE: The intention of this whole analysis wasn't to diffuse things more, it was to focus things more. I mean that was, that's really the idea.

WRISTON: Right. And I think that's the starting point and see, okay, where have we said we're going to grow industrially, where are these nodes and how are they doing and bring them in, make them, they'll come in, you know, because --

PRIDEMORE: Just remember you said that.

LEE: You got Cindy here so you can't, you know, you can't back out now.

PRIDEMORE: Other thoughts on the focus public investment piece?

MOSS: No. I would like to echo Jeff's comments though. I think sometimes we forget that we're engaged really in the business of long-range planning and that the planning process has to have some integrity and we can't ignore past commitments. Just as an example, you know, I would remind you that we've had a comprehensive plan that's been in effect now for almost 10 years, we had another comprehensive plan before that that was in effect for 14 years and we threw it out at the end of 14 years essentially and started over again, you know, that destroys the credibility, at least in my view, of the whole long-range comprehensive planning process.

And that's not to say that we're about to do that here, but I think Jeff's comments were on target that we have to constantly be looking back to see what did we do in the past and how or what we're doing in the future, how is what we're doing in the future going to affect the validity of that comprehensive planning process. The message here is that the whole long-range planning process gets to be pretty suspect if we don't do that.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, I think maybe the difference is, and the concern is, is I don't have quite as much concern about the existing nodes, I don't think those would lose their status, I don't think there's talk about that, it's just where do we make --

WRISTON: No, you're talking about industrial inventory and it does, it does. I mean, you know.

PRIDEMORE: But nobody's talking about going back through and rezoning things that were --

WRISTON: No, that's not the point. You open up more and it just slows down their absorption more. And they put the investment in and they, because they rely on these industrial, this is where the County wants to put their industrial nodes and you open up three, four more and they lose their, they lose their, you know, they compete more. And that's not to say that that's we don't want to do that or we do want to do that, but it becomes -- it's more of a balance than that. We're not saying that we're going to rezone them, but we're saying that they compete more. They put in -- you've had people come in and they put investments into this and they put infrastructure. And it's a very complex issue and I just --

PRIDEMORE: Sure. There's been considerable --

WRISTON: It's a balance.

PRIDEMORE: -- considerable comments both from the public sector and the private sector that we have this tremendous need for additional industrial plans, I mean that we get hounded about that constantly, so if we're going to add industrial lands, presumably we're going to want to do those in a nodal fashion and I think that's what we're talking about here.

WRISTON: Have you done an industrial land inventory?

PRIDEMORE: Yeah.

WRISTON: Was it earlier?

PRIDEMORE: Well, they, yeah. I mean and it depends --

MORRIS: Well, it's the comments of 2001.

PRIDEMORE: And I think the points you're making are very legitimate for you to make to those people who continually insist that we must open up these other industrial areas because it will have an impact on those people who have already made investments in the existing industrial areas; however, that's what we're getting very strongly moving forward is more industrial lands so.

STANTON: Let's go get jobs and then the question becomes can you really attract 70,000 more jobs to Clark County in the 20-year time frame if that's what we're planning the land supply for. The competition aspect is there. If we're not successful in getting it but we've identified the lands, you're right.

PRIDEMORE: And to give you the scope, the Chamber is recommending that we push for 135, 140,000 more jobs. That's --

STANTON: What's driving this.

WRISTON: I believe we have more lands opened up than people know. I mean we need to get people in to get public testimony.

MORRIS: Where have you been for the last two years?

WRISTON: Well, I've been, I've been, but we need to get more people in to testify to it. I mean the economy has dropped, and our economy has dropped, and I said this from the very first time I was on the Planning Commission eight years ago or whatever, that everyone who doesn't want growth and this and that, that some day people are going to be coming to you guys to be talking about jobs. And they're coming to you guys to talk about jobs and you don't just create jobs by opening up more land. I think we have the land. Or, you know, I mean we don't say we can't use more land, but just opening up land doesn't create the jobs.

PRIDEMORE: I think you're absolutely right.

WRISTON: So I mean I, I'm sorry.

PRIDEMORE: No, this is exactly what we struggle with and I think we recognize real strongly to your -- oh, shoot, I had a really good point and you started laughing and --

WRISTON: I didn't laugh.

PRIDEMORE: -- made me want to laugh.

BARCA: That happens to us all the time, especially with Jeff.

WRISTON: Yeah, but I didn't laugh, I just --

PRIDEMORE: Well, it might come back to me in a few minutes.

MOSS: I have a nuts and bolts question here that looking at this Table A-6 and I need somebody to explain this to me, I don't understand this.

PRIDEMORE: Which page?

MOSS: It's Table A-6 --

BARCA: Table A-6 in the back table.

MOSS: -- in the back and would somebody explain to me what those columns mean, I don't get these. It's this document, Jeff. This is a table that purports to show, I think, a cost of developing a job in any of these particular candidate areas and I'm not sure, I think I understand how that's arrived at in general, but I don't understand the two columns there in the middle. If somebody could just take one of those lines and explain to me what those numbers mean, it would be real helpful.

LEE: Vacant industrial and commercial and redevelopable --

WRISTON: Is that the comprised of --

MORRIS: The Port of Vancouver one.

MOSS: Where does this 7350 come from under Downtown Vancouver and why is it 1672 under the next column?

WRISTON: Where they made up --

MOSS: I must be missing some real obvious point here but --

CHISHOLM: Well, it's not entirely clear by looking at the table alone. The cost is held constant for each of the focus public investment areas across the board, but like we had said, we had to make a number of judgment decisions and assumptions and we didn't want those buried, we wanted for you to be able to second guess those and look at this from a number of different angles. So the first column down shows vacant industrial and commercial land. It's pretty much not subject to a whole lot of debate, there's nothing there now, it's not completely wet.

MOSS: So these are the costs per job only in that area?

CHISHOLM: Yes, sir, only in the vacant currently industrial and commercially zoned areas. The second one over begins to entertain some redevelopment concepts and as noted in here it's familiar with how debatable redevelopment and underutilized land assumptions can be and so that would be another way of looking at it. And then all the way on the other side you see some "other" included in this and "other" is even a further step where we have identified some lands that are not currently zoned for industrial or commercial activity. For instance, if there is a small -- the St. Johns corridor we were speaking of for instance, St. Johns and 72nd Avenue come together in a fashion to form that triangle. Currently the northern tip of that triangle is zoned residential and I expect that too many people who might want to live there perhaps and so it's conceivable that if we identified that and then prioritized those focus investment areas, we can step in and look at some of those residential lands that's not feasible under (inaudible) uses, convert them, and then with some parcel aggregation have the ability to put together even larger pieces of industrial property.

So whether you want to take it straightforward on just what's on the ground industrial right now without any of the planning assumptions involved, you can just use the first column and rank them there. Or if you want to make use of some of the assumptions that we put into the report, all of the tables are based upon the combination of industrial/commercial redevelopable and some of those other parcels that we thought might convert successfully.

PRIDEMORE: Basically Wriston's neighborhood you could add whatever.

BARCA: So then the Discovery Corridor under the vacant industrial lands, that's a typo, the $330,000 per job?

CHISHOLM: Well, I guess the approach would be a good deal different for the ones that aren't currently zoned that way and then we had to entertain how that zoning would come down. And so if an area is entertained for large parts of a business park, we went ahead and put a business park in. And, Laura, certainly chime in if I misstate something here because I don't want to mislead anyone. So in the rural area we had to assume that it was going to be zoned a certain fashion before we would even entertain it as a focus public investment area, but if it's inside the UGA, then we had to look at the current zoning and not just speculate.

MORRIS: What did you speculate?

BARCA: I don't understand the ranking on the bottom table which shows the highest cost per job at 136th Corridor but the Discovery Corridor showing a $330,000 per job seems like it should really be at least at the end.

PRIDEMORE: Well, the issue would be is if you look right now at in looking at the Discovery Cooridor, the land that is included within the Discovery Corridor focus public investment area right now is zoned overwhelmingly agriculture, rural residential, that would not appear as available acreage for development, therefore would not have jobs associated with it for the Discovery Corridor area. So in that first column there are very few jobs created under the existing zoning so you would have to do some of this redevelopment in this "other" which then suddenly brings in all of these additional acreages which (inaudible) so the cost gets spread further and drop dramatically.

MOSS: So the cost isn't constant for any of these, it's just what land base is --

PRIDEMORE: Am I saying this right, Derek?

LEE: Do you want to briefly explain how the costs were arrived at for these areas? Because one of the things in terms of total cost per job is you're going to have to build a whole arterial highway system to support the Discovery Corridor in addition to maybe doing major improvements along the Interstate highway and that is a huge cost item that influences this particular line item.

PRIDEMORE: I think though, exactly, but the difference between the different columns isn't those capital improvements or those capital costs, it's the zoning that is used and these zoning assumptions that are used. Laura, do you know --

LEE: Certainly zoning is (inaudible) at different densities.

PRIDEMORE: I'm trying very hard to avoid --

HUDSON: I'm trying to figure it out.

WRISTON: This table kind of --

BARCA: (Inaudible) cost per jobs.

PRIDEMORE: You know, I think the capital improvements is just the same.

WRISTON: It takes your --

PRIDEMORE: It's just how you zone it and whether you consider redevelopment of it.

MORRIS: Right. Because if you put it in right now and you calculated the jobs per acre that you calculate for rural residential and for ag and then you divided in your total infrastructure cost you come out 300,000, $330,000 apiece.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah, if you look at some of the other investment areas that overlap the urban growth boundary, you get this same kind of distortion in that first column.

BARCA: Well, why doesn't that distortion show up on the bottom table?

PRIDEMORE: Because the bottom table is just the last column. That's assuming you've gone through now and you've done some redevelopment and you've rezoned --

BARCA: Just the last column.

DELEISSEGUES: Under each one of these they've got (inaudible) jobs, they've got the costs, and all they did was take the costs, divide it by the jobs and that's the cost per job. That's pretty simple I think.

PRIDEMORE: And then in the different columns you assume different numbers that are actually being paid.

DELEISSEGUES: I think it's pretty accurate for a way of figuring out where the best bang for your buck would be.

WRISTON: With a few exceptions you're right, that's what I was just saying, it does -- there are a few exceptions in there that I don't --

MOSS: If I can just follow up with a question. What confuses me about this is if I look at the first column we're saying vacant industrial and commercial land here, I understand that it would take a huge infrastructure investment to provide the services to one of these particular areas. But let's take the Discovery Corridor area, it happens apparently that there's little vacant industrial and commercial land in the Discovery Corridor area over which to amortize all of that investment, but just looking at this as the casual reader might, if I go to the next column and say, okay, I'm going to add some redevelopable land in here, now the average cost per job dropped from 330 all the way down to 19,530. But what this doesn't say is that the amount of vacant industrial and commercial land in these two columns is vastly different.

PRIDEMORE: I don't think, and I think the consultants came to the same conclusion, the first column is not very relevant and the second column is only partially relevant, the third one's the one that's important and that's why that's the one that's going across the bottom of the page.

MOSS: Well, it is and that's why I've dwelled on this. I see this as being very significant in determining where to target this investment and I want to make sure that this chart is or that is understandable to anybody that reads it.

LEE: So an action item that we could record and review later would be to, you know, kind of ferret out what's happening here in Table A-6 and be able to explain why the numbers are turning out the way they are.

PRIDEMORE: And we might want to redesign this so that it's clearer for anybody who picks it up because this would be pretty confusing.

STANTON: Yeah. Maybe it's only the column headings but somehow.

MORRIS: Current zoning, altered zoning.

HUDSON: It's a typo.

LEE: Is there a typo?

HUDSON: It should be 33,000.

PRIDEMORE: 33,000.

HUDSON: It is a typo.

MORRIS: Oh, it is a typo.

PRIDEMORE: So there's just an extra zero in there?

HUDSON: The zero is wrong.

MORRIS: Well, thanks anyway, Craig.

PRIDEMORE: Even still I think what I said is still the same, it's just not that -- no, I think the explanation I said is still the same, it's just not, it is grossly different for that corridor.

WRISTON: It's still unclear when you drop to the bottom.

HUDSON: What it is is the first column is only vacant lands.

PRIDEMORE: That's zoned currently industrial/commercial.

HUDSON: The second column is zoned commercial/industrial. The second column or the third one over includes what would be redevelopable or underutilized land. And in the case of the Discovery Corridor there's a lot of land that has a farmhouse on 20 acres or something, that counts as developed in the vacant and buildable land model, so you have to call it redevelopable land and assume it will redevelop in order to put it into the industrial land base. So that middle column, you add those redevelopable parcels in. And the last one, Derek is right, most of the extra land you're adding in there is land that is zoned either residential or public but currently is vacant, so you would have to make a decision that you were going to rezone it and take it out of your residential land base and put it into industrial land base. That's what's in that last column.

PRIDEMORE: Then we probably just need to figure out some way to show that that somebody picking it up wouldn't get terribly confused. Other thoughts on the focus public investment information? I wanted to -- I remember what I was going to say and that was in answer to Jeff's question about the industrial lands inventory issues. The industrial lands analysis that was done by staff suggested that in I believe all of these or virtually all of the proposed scenarios we've got ample industrial land. The business community has pushed back on that saying that a vast majority of that land, in other words it would be all of it, is too industrial or too environmentally constrained or too small of parcels to be usable and therefore it's not -- you shouldn't count all of that industrial land. So the issue with it is in terms of raw acreage we've got plenty, but is it marketable because of environmental and parcel size.

STANTON: And other factors that keep it from being prime which could be infrastructure --

PRIDEMORE: Infrastructure.

STANTON: -- roads, that kind of thing.

PRIDEMORE: The infrastructure puts it in the secondary. And what they complained most about is the tertiary, that they suggested --

WRISTON: When was the last time we really reviewed that, '99 or something?

PRIDEMORE: No, it was 2001.

WRISTON: 2001. Was it 2001?

DELEISSEGUES: I do think if you read this from the front to the back a lot of the questions you had would be answered. It's displayed in the back based on the fact that you read the front.

PRIDEMORE: And the vast majority of citizens who go through this are going to do what we do, which is go to the executive summary and so we need to be able to present it. Let's take 10 minutes.

STANTON: You're probably the only one, though, that needs a break.

PRIDEMORE: Am I the only one who wants a break?

MORRIS: Oh, Cindy does.

PRIDEMORE: Is there a hope to get through the entire agenda tonight?

LEE: You know, we can get through as much as you want to get through.

PRIDEMORE: Interestingly enough Number 4 is probably the most discussion.

LEE: Well, before we got into that we wanted to give you some of this background because we know we were late in getting materials out.

PRIDEMORE: I just wanted to give people a sense that what we're doing right now is kind of information, 4 is where the real discussion is likely to take place.

DELEISSEGUES: Craig, do we have a quitting time?

PRIDEMORE: We don't but I would entertain a reasonable time, 9:00, 9:30.

MOSS: 8:30.

BARCA: 9:00.

PRIDEMORE: 8:10. It is very early.

LEE: I vote till 10:30.

PRIDEMORE: I think you guys are earning all these big dollars.

WRISTON: 9:00, 9:30 sounds good, Craig.

PRIDEMORE: We'll go till 9:00 and we'll do a check and see if folks want to go a little later or if we want to just roll it into next week's discussion.

(Pause in proceedings.)

PRIDEMORE: Let's go ahead. And I told Wally at the break he needed to go through and evaluate all of these for us, commercial real estate.

STANTON: Yeah, I know, he's sitting back here, go for it, Wally.

PRIDEMORE: Let's move on with the revenue/cost comparison.

LEE: This is an area obviously that's had a lot of attention. I'm not sure that we can quite give you the type of comparison you're looking at, but let's give you what we have at this point in time. And probably the cost revenue comparison will be tightened up quite a bit once we do have a preferred alternative to work with, but I think Evan can address at least how we're looking at things on a countywide basis.

DUST: Before you in your packet you have this I guess it's about a two inch, two and a half inch binder, and if you look at it, it's sort of got some space. It's probably level-of-service B in terms of binder capacity versus your EIS comments binder which is level-of-service F. I'm not going to walk you through this.

PRIDEMORE: Spoken like a transportation planner. Good.

WRISTON: Number 4.

LEE: Hurry up.

RUPLEY: It's a nice notebook, Evan, thank you.

DUST: The reason why it's got some capacity is that what you have is a preliminary analysis. It is designed to give a view of revenue between the alternatives for County capital transportation projects and for the County's general fund that is only accurate to a comparable level, just like the alternatives have these large blocks of color. This analysis is not at a disaggregate level in the sense it does not pretend that under a given alternative you're going to have exactly, let's pick a number here, exactly $600 million under Alternative One adjusted for the planning control total population, that's not the purpose of this analysis. The purpose of this analysis was to compare the alternatives in terms of revenue and to do it in a basis that it could be compared to the capital costs identified in the draft EIS. Now what's interesting is when you make that comparison for the alternatives --

LEE: Do you want to do the light set.

WISER: The first one. The second one. The second one.

LEIN: The third one. There you go.

DUST: You have three of the alternatives up there on the screen. It would appear from the estimated revenue and the estimated costs that for the County's transportation system we do all right. We were -- in fact we got some revenue in excess of cost and that trend continues for the other two alternatives which I'll put up shortly. However, costs that occur within the urban areas that will be annexed are attributed to the cities. We don't have comparable revenue numbers from the cities. The capital cost for C-TRAN does not assume any expansion of service to serve the new urban areas under the alternatives, so that capital cost is fairly low.

And where our hit comes in transportation capital facilities is on the State highway system with costs that are dramatically in excess of those expected under the current metropolitan transportation improvement program. Historically our revenue for State mobility projects since 1969 through 2001 has averaged roughly $11 million of investment per year. The nickel package of projects coming to Clark County, if we took that investment and spread it over the next 20 years, it will be half that level of investment. We know already that the $11 million of mobility investment on the State system hasn't kept up with the land use growth that we've experienced so far. And clearly the State system under almost all the alternatives takes the biggest hit.

What is interesting about the revenue estimates is that generally the more growth you get, the more revenue you get. Sort of makes sense. The challenge of the revenue estimation process, and one that I don't think as staff we have fully conquered yet, is almost all of our revenue history and our revenue systems are oriented along the lines of the growth we've had in this community. If you notice Alternative One produces the most estimated revenue. It's the greatest growth, it's also the greatest amount of residential growth and that's the challenge. Our estimation systems in my opinion tend to favor revenue generation from residential versus revenue generation from employment. So bear that in mind as you review these numbers and you review those --

WRISTON: Why?

DUST: -- comparisons.

BARCA: I'd like for you to repeat that before you tell him why.

WRISTON: Why though?

DUST: You want me to repeat?

BARCA: Repeat what you said that caused him to say "why."

DUST: Okay. Our revenue estimation system tends to better predict revenue from residential than revenue from employment.

PRIDEMORE: It tends to better predict, Evan, the first time you said that residential generated more revenue. Which are you saying?

DUST: Tends to generate. From the way we can estimate, it looks like residential generates more revenue. And that's because if you look at the pieces of the revenue puzzle, now I'm going to try to dip into my memory of Glen's excellent presentation, the majority of County revenue comes from property tax, the majority of the assessed value tends to be residential. We collect sales tax on the construction materials used in the construction of housing, so if you build a lot more housing, you have a lot more revenue in sales tax from residential uses.

WRISTON: So we have a flawed modeling system.

DUST: Well, I'm not sure. We don't have an income tax, we don't have the ability to charge business and occupation tax, so the tax systems that are oriented towards employment we don't have.

MORRIS: And, Evan, you're only talking capital side?

DUST: I'm talking primarily capital side.

MORRIS: Capital side. You're not talking about how much it costs to educate children after those new revenue streams are completed?

DUST: I'm not talking anything about the demand or the cost associated with residential development and whether the net represents a good deal or not. We haven't -- I haven't examined that enough to form an opinion.

BARCA: So then, excuse me, then a clarification of what we're seeing up here. The different amounts of revenue based on each of the alternatives, those numbers represent gross available figures, gross numbers for available transportation capital improvement?

DUST: Correct.

BARCA: And it's exclusively for transportation capital improvement?

DUST: Yes.

MORRIS: And the last time we did these the State hadn't, as I recall you hadn't factored in the most recent State transportation budget. Have you added those in yet?

DUST: I did look at that and historically it's about half of our historic mobility revenue if that budget is all we get for the next 20 years.

PRIDEMORE: But is that reflected in the 123.74 million?

DUST: That is the -- the $123.74 million over in present value.

PRIDEMORE: The question is either just "yes" or "no." The 123.74 represents what we've got right now with the nickel --

DUST: Represents 50 percent of the historic trend.

MORRIS: It does not reflect, then, the new transportation budget. It doesn't, it can't, (inaudible) historically --

PRIDEMORE: The new nickel tax is that in that 123.74 or not?

DUST: Not exclusively.

MORRIS: I think the answer is no, it doesn't because --

MOSS: Yes or no.

MORRIS: -- because there's a ton of improvements along the Interstates that are in the transportation budget that aren't included in there.

DUST: The challenge is that what State DOT has told us repeatedly previously has been once we finish all the construction that you see in the region on the State system we're Zombied, we have no more construction money. And so if the nickel is new construction money coming into the system, that nickel only buys you construction projects at about 50 percent of the historic State investment.

PRIDEMORE: You said earlier that the historic State was roughly $11 million a year, which over the 20 years would be $220 million. You're showing up here a figure that's about 50 percent of that?

DUST: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: So you're suggesting to me from this if I'm reading all in between all the lines of what you're saying that 123.74 does represent the five cent gas tax that was just approved?

DUST: If there was no other source of mobility funding coming into the County from the State.

LEE: Because that is what the State officials have been telling us is the likely revenue outlook at the State.

PRIDEMORE: So what do we draw from this, Evan? What use is this chart to us at this point?

WRISTON: You go, girl. That's good.

DUST: I would say that the inference you can draw is that regardless of which alternative you pick, the State system is going to be in pretty bad shape unless they can come up with some other source of revenue.

LEIN: Plus you don't know about C-TRAN and the cities.

DUST: And we don't know about C-TRAN and the cities other than the City of Vancouver has stated and is going through a task force process to try to find a funding package for roughly $14 million of transportation investment per year.

PRIDEMORE: So just true or false, Evan, just true or false, just one word, one word only, based on what we know right now we cannot afford any of these scenarios, these alternatives for transportation?

DUST: True.

WRISTON: He did it.

MORRIS: Good. Good.

PRIDEMORE: So that's what we can draw from this, that's the sum, the summation?

DUST: Right.

PRIDEMORE: Questions or comments of Evan?

MORRIS: I guess I just have a comment in general about general purpose jurisdictions growing dependency on growth to finance ourselves because since the 101 percent property tax limit and the MVET we have just become significantly more dependent on growth altogether. And today when I was out at Battle Ground they were saying that if all of their sales taxed revenue, which in this year's budget is in excess of their property tax, that at least a half of that has come from sales tax on new construction. So it, I mean we just --

PRIDEMORE: It would be interesting --

MORRIS: -- are unfortunately caught in a bind where financially we are tied to growth and at the other end of it we have no resources to provide for it after it happens. So the capital part of it that Evan's talking about is the simple part really.

PRIDEMORE: And maybe while it's still certainly arguable that whole growth, that you're relying on growth for the revenues, but that growth has a one time impact and doesn't help us with our court systems or any of that.

MORRIS: No, absolutely not, exactly. It's only capital that helps us.

STANTON: I think that's the picture he was trying to make, you know.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah. Yeah. No, I think that's a really good point.

STANTON: You know, we continue to not have a problem with the capital, it's the ongoing expenses.

PRIDEMORE: So that's what you guys are for, what's the solution on that?

WRISTON: Or further discussion.

DELEISSEGUES: Take it under advisement.

WRISTON: They get it, you'll get it ad nauseam I'm sure.

PRIDEMORE: Okay. Any other thoughts on that? Let's move on to the review of the decision factors.

LEE: Okay. I tried to present these decision factors because based on a lot of the things that we've heard --

PRIDEMORE: Pat, you're going to be working off of the memo --

LEE: Yeah, I'm working off the staff report.

PRIDEMORE: Which is the June 12th memorandum "SUBJECT: Preferred Alternative Decision-Making Process."

LEE: Right. Right. And I'm, you know, I don't think I need to go through where we're on in the plan process, background, all that, the decision factors is really my attempt to put on the table what I think are the true policy issues that we have heard are out there from all the sources of information that have been developed and have been taken in. I recognize it is -- I tried to make it a manageable list, there could be many others, but I do think, however, the body's determine to address these issues is going to have a very significant effect on what the preferred alternative is going to look like and so I tried to structure it to bring out that true policy discussion.

The first thing that if you go to -- well, a short list is on Page 3, Decision Factors/Policy Discussion, 1 through 8, and then subsequent to that I do each item, throw out a little bit of information to maybe get the discussion going. First, fulfill legal requirements. We are in the process of doing a 10-year review which does require us to identify a boundary that can, an urban growth boundary that can accommodate the next 20 years of growth; i.e., through 2023, and we have to pick the population rate from within the range presented by OFM. Now it's a policy choice where within the range you want to select, but it has to be within the range and the range of a medium, which is what OFM says, is most likely 1.95 percent; low 1.36 percent; high 2.52 percent. And this is updated information from the information you had in 2001 when you had requested preliminary which had a wider span between the low and the high and the midpoint was about 1.86 at that point, so this is sort of revised forecast. The 1.5 population rate that we have been working with and developed a lot of the alternatives is still within the range, but, again, that's a policy choice for the body's to make in terms of what they feel is the most appropriate range.

And just so I can hasten my presentation, my reference to Page 6, Number 5, really gets into just that issue of sort of some of the rationale for the 1.5 that was presented in 2001 trying to accept the fair share of the housing within the region but not more. So that is, I think, the first critical factor that will certainly influence the look of the preferred alternative. And I don't know if you want me to go through each of these first, stop and talk about each one as we go through them. What would be do you think most --

PRIDEMORE: I guess my sense would be let's do one at a time. It's somewhat tieing over, I just you raised the first issue and the population forecast and yet this table under Number 2 seems to be pretty relevant for that, that issue too. Well, maybe it would be best just to go through the whole thing and see how we do. All right, let's do that, go through the whole thing.

LEE: Okay. One of the challenges that we've had through this whole process is that, you know, we kind of build statistical models based on a lot of assumptions and we have also as result of the State legislation had to do a buildable lands report that has been submitted that sort of monitored what actual densities we were achieving, and I think the sensitivity of all of these assumptions really plays out in the size of the urban growth boundary that we'll be dealing with in the preferred alternative, so let me walk through those.

One, at the present time most of the alternatives except Alternative Three use a market factor. In other words we determine what the capacity needed is to accommodate growth, then for residential and commercial we add another 25 percent to that and for industrial another 50 percent to that. So when you use that you're automatically inflating the amount of land that would be needed to accommodate the growth that is forecast regardless of the alternative, and except for Alternative Three all of them have the market factor built into them. There may be good reasons for using the market factor, but it certainly does have an incredible effect on the size of the urban growth boundary that we're looking at.

The second thing that also has a major effect is the infrastructure setaside that we're using in our assumptions. When we pulled plat maps and things to do the 215 report, we came out with an infrastructure usage of about 27.5 percent. The number that we're using in the assumptions is 38 percent, so you're basically 10 percent in excess of what the observed values are. Again, when you're calculating what the demand is for land to accommodate urban growth, that has a sensitive relationship and does extend it.

PRIDEMORE: Let me clarify on that, Pat. The infrastructure setaside also contained government lands, parks, all of those other common, was that part of this 27.5 percent calculation as well?

LEE: Well, there is -- well, there's actually -- even before we get into these assumptions there's some other assumptions that dilute the yield you get when you bring in an acre of land. For example, all tax exempt properties except those owned by the ports which presumably aren't in the development business, but school district properties, et cetera, like that, they were thrown out of the inventory to begin with.

PRIDEMORE: Well, just to --

LEE: So you've thrown those out of the available buildable lands inventory. Then in addition to that you're using the 38 percent infrastructure factor.

PRIDEMORE: And in that 38 percent, when it was presented to us through the PMTAC process and everything that 38 percent did include percentages for parks, schools?

LEE: There was some concern that the Clean Water Act requirements, salmon issues, might result in some changes in regulations that might increase that. We all know that process hasn't played itself out yet so it's hard to get a handle on it. It is also, you know, was identified that there might be, yes, there is going to be certain amount of land that's allocated towards parks and things like that that might be picked up as part of this 38 percent.

PRIDEMORE: The way you said that it sounded odd though. You said all those lands were thrown out, the tax exempt lands and everything were thrown out at the beginning, which makes sense for the vacant buildable lands inside existing urban growth boundaries, but when you're expanding urban growth boundaries, you're going to have to add those lands, some of those lands, back in.

LEE: When we tried to size the boundaries for the various alternatives as shown, we did attempt to run the vacant buildable lands model in those areas so that we had comparable sets of data.

MORRIS: What does that mean? How do you do that?

MOSS: But are you allowing for future acquisition of school lands, park lands --

MORRIS: Park lands.

MOSS: -- within that --

PRIDEMORE: The PMTAC, that information, those were supposed to be captured in this 38 percent, where did you capture them elsewise?

LEE: Let me get back to that. Jose, you want to chip in.

ALVAREZ: They are in the 38 percent.

PRIDEMORE: Right. I mean I know they're in the 38 percent. My question is: In the 27.5 percent part are they included?

HUDSON: Yes, they're in the 27.5 too. We reran it for Vancouver on the area and our city is actually 23 percent or less through the whole --

PRIDEMORE: And is that based on actual or is that based on standard?

HUDSON: That's based on actual once built.

PRIDEMORE: All right. And are you meeting standard? Are you meeting standard for parks?

HUDSON: Yes. Well, yes, overall. The difference between neighborhood and community and different areas of the city I would --

PRIDEMORE: But your total acreage you're meeting within that 27.5 percent, that's keeping you at your adopted standard?

HUDSON: Yes.

PRIDEMORE: And that's got provisions for schools, government facilities, libraries?

HUDSON: Yes.

BARCA: Both of them.

MORRIS: Well, inside the city of Vancouver does the City of Vancouver even own -- does the Vancouver School District even own any land that hasn't been built on inside the city limits? So what you would see happen there would be just expansion of existing schools rather than withdrawal of an empty parcel from the inventory. All of the schools construction inside the city limits in Vancouver has been rebuilding and expansion, it's in the urban growth area where they've been taking new land.

LEIN: There are parcels with both Evergreen and Vancouver in the city that are not built on.

MORRIS: There are?

LEIN: Yes. There are very few.

PRIDEMORE: I take it the point, though, being taken is that as we add this additional population, you will need to add additional acreage out in the --

MORRIS: In the new growth areas.

PRIDEMORE: And so again is that -- it wouldn't have been calculated within Vancouver's presumably?

HUDSON: No, we've got the population going to the schools now and the ratio is 27.5 percent. In other words, when you look at houses and jobs and then compare the infrastructure that goes to serve that area, it's 27.5 percent, including parks and schools. So that is unless the pattern of development trend changes or unless this passes, something happens like the salmon friendly stuff makes a much bigger infrastructure requirement than you've got right now, the pattern if you continue of what you have would be 27.5 percent. That's in the trend.

MORRIS: In the city of Vancouver though.

HUDSON: And the UGA. The city is actually 23 percent, but countywide it's 27.5.

MOSS: Including the city?

HUDSON: Yeah.

DELEISSEGUES: Do you include fire stations in there for example? You know, with Fire District 5 leasing space?

HUDSON: Fire stations, police stations, schools, anything that's public land.

PRIDEMORE: Churches?

HUDSON: I don't think we counted those --

MOSS: But if --

HUDSON: -- in the 27.5.

MOSS: But just looking at the numbers, though, if the average is 23 in the city and it's 27 and a half in the entire urban growth boundary did you say or countywide?

HUDSON: Is it county?

PRIDEMORE: Well, it wouldn't, it wouldn't be countywide --

MOSS: Then the percentage must be considerably higher.

PRIDEMORE: -- in the urban growth areas.

HUDSON: What we did is we came out at 28 percent for the Vancouver UGA and 23 percent for the city and I thought that 27.5 was unincorporated area.

MOSS: Unincorporated area only?

HUDSON: Primarily Vancouver UGA but (inaudible) some other UGAs.

MOSS: Well, here's my question: If it's 23 percent in the core of Vancouver area and 27 and a half percent in the entire urban growth boundary, then the area that we're really talking about doing the expansion into must have something higher than 27 and a half percent in order to average that with 23 and produce 27 and a half? Am I missing some point here?

MORRIS: I don't think so. I think the question would be so what is it in the existing Vancouver urban growth boundary that you see as infrastructure.

MOSS: I thought I was hearing 27 and a half percent. Or what is it (inaudible) --

MORRIS: Well, that's across the --

MOSS: -- the city and --

MORRIS: That's across the board. That's across the board. But if you've got 23 percent inside the city --

PRIDEMORE: That's recent.

MORRIS: -- and 27 average, but we don't know what it is in the Vancouver urban growth boundary exclusive of the city.

PRIDEMORE: Is that right?

HUDSON: No, that was the 28.

PRIDEMORE: So it's 28 in the unincorporated Vancouver urban growth boundary?

HUDSON: Or 27 and a half, that's what we looked at.

MOSS: Outside the city though? Exclusive of the city?

HUDSON: Exclusive of the city.

LEE: Okay. So I've put as an action item we can go back and check that, find out specifically if we've included those in that 27.5 percent figure or not.

WRISTON: And what the figures are and how they relate to Vancouver urban or whatever.

LEE: The next assumption that, again, the size of the UGB is going to be sensitive to is the assumption of development on critical land. The assumption we're using is 5 percent. What we observed that lands designated as critical lands we've seen development on 10 percent of them. Another factor that comes from the census data is the assumption that we have been using in terms of household size which weights the 75 percent detached, 25 percent attached is 2.43 persons per household, the census reports that average household size in Clark County is 2.69 persons per household. And then a final assumption that we'd call attention to is the employment density assumptions. On a gross acre basis we're yielding about -- the assumption is 9 employees per acre for industrial, the observed is 10 for commercial. The assumption is 12 and the actual yield we observed was 22 employees per acre. So again, the point being that the sizing issue, that is one of the key issues here is very much sensitive to these factors.

And then the Catch-22 we can get into is on the capital facilities side. So what staff did when trying to do the DEIS, estimate costs, et cetera, we sort of developed, if you go to the next page, tables indicating what the controls were, but when we inputted the data to do the capital facilities analysis, we upsized things by quite a bit so that in terms of the capital facilities analysis that is done we wanted to be sure that we did not undersize facilities because of the flex in the assumptions that were made. And just in general terms those are referenced on the table on Page 5.

DELEISSEGUES: Pat, and the focus public investment plan, do you know which set of numbers they used when they figured the cost per job? Did they use --

LEE: Cost per job would be using the higher end of the numbers as opposed to the control total numbers.

DELEISSEGUES: So they used 10 and 22?

LEE: Yeah. Well, again, the decisions were made in estimating job potential if -- in areas that seem to be developing this way was assigned a lower, or if it was developing this way it was assigned a higher yield, but overall it would be a higher yield. It would reflect the higher numbers than the assumptions.

BARCA: Each area had different numbers or the potential for different numbers. If you look at each of the nodes they had a box in there that showed how many jobs per acre they were assigning to it and some had higher amounts than others when I looked at that.

PRIDEMORE: Let me just make sure I'm tracking this right and hearing the right thing here. So under, for example, Alternative Two it says total population this is 486,225 which is the 1.5 percent projection with all of these assumptions and the changes, and yet you say at build-out that would actually be 558,990.

LEE: Yeah, we call the effective build-out that we use for sizing --

PRIDEMORE: So it's kind of the actual capacity of the land will be this --

LEE: Right. That's not being that --

PRIDEMORE: Let me finish my statement, please.

LEE: Oh, I'm sorry, sir.

PRIDEMORE: Just this, I want to make sure I'm getting this right. So that 558,000 works out to, I don't know, what about, 2, 2.1 percent population growth that we would actually be developing capacity for?

LEE: I haven't backed into the percentage.

PRIDEMORE: And then under jobs here, so Alternative Two says, you know, notionally the numbers say we're planning for 44,615 jobs but in fact the capacity that we're actually doing is 70,950?

LEE: That we're basing the capital facilities analysis on is, yes.

PRIDEMORE: So based on that you're using the larger numbers for what you put into the capital facilities plan so that we have --

LEE: Which also plays out in the cost figures that you see.

MORRIS: What did you do in these with the market factor? Did you keep the 25 percent market factor in your build-out capacity or not?

LEE: I think we basically, I think we -- if it was zoned for a certain type of use or the assumption was it's zoned for a certain type of use, it was just assumed that it could build to the full entitlement of that use. So in other words, some of the reason that numbers are higher in the effective is because we have anticipated some of the effect of the market factor where you have more land, you can fit more, but from a capital facilities if you fit more, you're going to need bigger, bigger facilities. So we wanted to make sure that we captured what the higher total was for the capital facilities analysis in part was caused by market factor, in part by some of these employment density issues and other things that we've talked about.

MORRIS: Can you reconcile or can someone at some point in time reconcile, then, the build-out numbers in this table with the build-out numbers on Page 102 of the DEIS or can -- especially Alternative Three I've been looking at because -- well, we don't need to go into it right now, but they don't add and subtract all the same.

LEE: All right, we'll do that, another action item. Okay. Did you want to have any discussion on those sort of the population and the assumptions together before reviewing or do you want me to just
keep --

PRIDEMORE: Well, it sounds like let's just review the whole thing and then we'll focus on what people want to focus on or consider. We'll see what time it is and where we want to go.

MORRIS: It's going to be time to go home.

LEE: Okay. In terms of the next issue we had presentations on the economic development element as being proposed. Unlike population we are not limited to picking within a range of where we want to go, though we need to be credible in whatever total it is that we're shooting for in terms of job creation. Historical perspective listed in Item 3(b) between 1990 and 2000 the Employment Security Department indicated 37,000 jobs were created and that was a very high job growth decade, not something we've experienced in the last two years certainly. And the Bureau of Economic Analysis, which in addition to covering employers that pay into worker's compensation fund covers commission based, self-employed, the total was estimated at 51,039. So depending on -- that is why you had a difference in the numbers, the covered versus the noncovered employment. But again, that gives you sort of a 10-year history of covered and noncovered pursuant to the Bureau of Economic Analysis. And as has been discussed earlier, just on a shear numbers basis you can fit all the jobs within the industrial lands that are currently zoned.

From a policy perspective I think the key is do we have the right parcels in the right locations to do what we want to do, but in terms of a numbers analysis we have sufficient industrial land in terms of acreages available and I'm sure there's going to be a lot of discussion on how different jurisdictions feel that emphasis should be placed in terms of location of employment areas. I think we've made reference to the CREDC target industries list and once we are able to settle on kind of the job goal that we're looking for, including considering the locational strategic factors, we'll then be able to develop a map that tries to reflect those policy choices that you've made and that will have both the size and locational dimension in terms of how much the urban growth boundary may expand, for what purposes and where. So pretty key on how the ultimate alternative is going to turn out.

I think Derek gave a pretty thorough presentation on the focus public investment strategy so I don't think I need to report that, repeat that at this point. We've already made allusion to Number 5, the sort of the policy decision about accommodating a fair share of the forecast population growth and the rationale behind that. And I think the one thing where I really don't think we're going to be in a position until we have a preferred alternative and we begin to put the capital facilities plan together is the question of are we going to have some levels of service trade-offs that we're going to have to deal with on the transportation system, obviously other areas as well, just because of a discrepancy between revenues and shortfalls to support those things. I think those are really policy choices that are going to come before the group here.

And other factors, I think two things that we've heard, or at least two groups that we've heard quite a bit from regarding when you're looking at particularly distributing employment, school districts have an interest in trying to do that in some sort of equitable manner, as do the cities, because the cities are willing to accommodate a fair share of population, they want the employment to come along with it so they can match servicing needs with commitments they make to accommodate the population. School districts perhaps even tougher because we do have, as Oliver mentioned, some totally rural school districts, but it's certainly an issue that is out there and has a place at the policy discussion table, how would you want to weight that in making your decisions on where we should be locating jobs and population in the future.

And then I think Number 8 we touched on earlier, kind of the list of factors and the CREDC letter that I pointed out to you earlier. So that are, that is a short list of some key policy decisions that I really think give a good starting place for policy discussions on where we want to go with the preferred plan.

PRIDEMORE: Comments or questions?

BARCA: I'm wondering what we're going to do with the aspect of the observed numbers in both the aspect of infrastructure setaside and then specifically the employment numbers when we look at the aspect of commercial acreage and how it's so much more so than the original assumption is 22 jobs per acre as opposed to the 12 in the original assumption. Are we going to focus an effort, then, to look at where we have been able to capitalize historically in that aspect and move away somewhat from industrial lands towards the aspects of focused commercial because it gets us towards job numbers? Does that make sense under these circumstances?

PRIDEMORE: I don't know if I would, I don't know if I would take -- I think the question he raises is an issue, one, I don't think if I'd take it that's it's the most commercial jobs or not as well paying as some of the others. So I don't know that --

BARCA: Well, you would say that as supposition, but what do we substantiate that with?

PRIDEMORE: At this point for me it's just common knowledge. I don't know if we have any --

MORRIS: The SIC codes could give that to us real easily.

LEE: Yeah. Yeah, we could reference back to SIC codes. I think in terms of, you know, some of the modeling efforts we view we break out retail and other. Retail you would expect you do get quite a few employees per acre, but you do not get particularly high salaries as a rule.

PRIDEMORE: This is such a large difference. It's not a difference between gross versus net acres, it's just actually 22 gross employees per gross acre.

LEE: Yes, these are gross figures.

DELEISSEGUES: One of the things that I think is a little confusing is on this focus public investment plan where they show jobs per acre but they show it based on the current zoning and then they have the infrastructure costs to bring it up to what would be needed and probably rezoned so that it would be as good as or as viable as any other land as far as being able to accommodate industry or commercial, so then you would use the 22 jobs per acre it seems to me, you wouldn't use that smaller number, at the same time you were looking at the investment that it would take to bring that land up to the industrial zoned land.

LEE: Yeah, I see what you're talking about.

DELEISSEGUES: Like Ron was pointing out, that the number of jobs in there based on the zoning that is there now, agriculture, you know, some of them are 5 acres. Like in the corridor where we were looking at, it says 60 parcels that are 5 acres that are smaller, but it would seem to me when they looked at the cost to bring that up into industrial zoning, they would have had to put those parcels together, there would have been a cost for roads for bringing all that so you couldn't use those smaller number of jobs, then, after you invested the money.

PRIDEMORE: Well, the way these formulas -- I mean it doesn't work with the dollars, it's not too much about the dollars, but the way these figures, this formula is driven, you've already taken out that infrastructure for those roads and the sewer, stormwater, all that land has been taken out by that infrastructure setaside up above. And we can argue whether it's 27.5 or 38, but that's already been taken into account. That's why I was asking about the gross that on before all of those or after you've removed all of those lands you still get 22 per gross acre, what was it when you started out.

DELEISSEGUES: All I'm saying is you couldn't use that as a way to prioritize where you would put your investment because it only produces smaller, what looks like a smaller number of jobs, but that wouldn't be the case if --

PRIDEMORE: I think the relevant issue with this and the way he's presenting it here and the question is is that if we make the assumption that we get 12 employees per gross acre, then we essentially are doing almost twice as much commercial acreage, we need twice as much commercial acreage to yield the same number of jobs.

DELEISSEGUES: Right.

PRIDEMORE: Where based on actuals here we're going to get twice as many jobs as the formula is telling us today and we're planning for a lot more jobs than what the numbers actually say.

BARCA: And to try and bring that back to this focus public investment plan, just as an example, if you look at what they put in for Burnt Bridge Creek area, they're saying commercial area will produce 12 jobs per acre, industrial 9, which is the regular formula, but if you go to the Downtown Vancouver area, they have already projected 20 jobs per acre for both commercial and industrial so they're taking that into account in this report for the sake of the nodes. I guess what I was really trying --

LEE: That 20 basically references back to sort of this business park concept that we've floated. So on the alternatives where you see -- and you're right, there's not an exact one-to-one correlation between the maps and the FPIAs, but in terms of the assumptions used, the assumptions used for that assessment, you know, you have the acres, but then on a per acre basis you have the 9 for commercial, 12, 9 for industrial, 12 for commercial, 20 for business park, but David Evans going out and seeing what was happening out in the field in those areas made some choices, if you will, we see this one more likely to develop as a 20, but the base assumption numbers are comparable but they're applied differently.

PRIDEMORE: Will we do that kind of analysis in the final on a preferred alternative or would we stay with this level, I mean, where you're looking at job densities in specific geographic areas?

LEE: I think -- well, really that depends on how strategic you want to become in terms of the economic development discussion. I think you could go either way.

MORRIS: I guess my broad brush read on it certainly is that I don't think that the number we've predicted 12 is far too low for the commercial end so that never sounded realistic to me. I don't know if 22's the right one or not because if you're factoring in Downtown Vancouver, you're going to have a density that's not going to be achieved anywhere else because nobody else is planning to do that, so that you might even want to eliminate. But I guess when it comes to industrial land, which has been the focus of the discussion, I don't want us to do what we've been doing. So looking at the densities that we have been achieving and suggesting that that gives us enough land for what we want to do, I guess that's an area where I feel like too much history hampers a vision for what we want to have changed. So it's really in the industrial area that it seems to me we want to limit our relationship to history and industrial and modify, I think, in commercial, but obviously 12 is too low. I mean I can't think of an area inside an urban growth boundary that's zoned commercial where you've only got 12 employees per acre. And I'm assuming these are 12 FTEs.

PRIDEMORE: I wonder how you compare, though, because isn't a Dollar Tree going on commercial?

MORRIS: Well, it is, it's going on commercial, but there's a lot of commercial left out there too. And that's one distribution center and there's going to be a lot more commercial going in there so.

PRIDEMORE: Right. My question would be is the 22 from looking at a Wal-Mart or is it something that's averaged in the Wal-Mart and the Dollar Tree warehouse that --

MORRIS: Or is it averaged over a Dollar Tree and Downtown Vancouver but --

PRIDEMORE: What exactly is in there?

MORRIS: Where did it come from?

LEE: Well, at least I think if you're looking at a distribution center, typically we would evaluate under the industrial numbers in terms of the job creation.

PRIDEMORE: That makes sense. That's actually going on commercial land though, isn't it?

LEE: I couldn't tell you because of the changes that were being made out there whether it's commercial, mixed use or industrial.

MORRIS: I don't know either, but it's all -- it truly is integrated out there. That whole development is integrated.

LEE: But typically when we think of warehouse distribution, we think of industrial land

and we think of a lower employees per acre density.

BARCA: So am I hearing some scepticism about whether 22 jobs per acre is real in the commercial lands or are you --

PRIDEMORE: I don't know. I guess I would --

MORRIS: Oh, it's definitely not real, I guess, from my perspective. It's definitely not real.

PRIDEMORE: I would express some scepticism just in the interest of certainty we're talking about reducing the amount of commercial lands by 50 percent. On that sort of magnitude I think we should be pretty sure that that's what the right number is before we do something like that.

BARCA: Then can we bring forward a more detailed analysis of how the 22 was achieved?

HUDSON: We have been doing from looking trying to get at the jobs that are major employers and the acreage that they occupy and come up with some employees per acre estimates. In commercial you have to remember you include office too, and when you add office development in it gets -- it can get pretty high. The numbers in the Vancouver area are -- actually the ones we've looked at so far are averaging out around 28 employees per gross acre and so 22 looks low for inside the city of Vancouver.

PRIDEMORE: Would office zoning be more appropriate for the business park category? I guess is there maybe another number for commercial that's --

HUDSON: I guess what I'm saying is that we don't have a -- because there's so much overlap now between what's industrial and what's office and between commercial and that it's hard to tell. All we can do is take employers who are on commercially zoned land and look at it that way and we're coming out -- I'll bring you the numbers of or send them to you.

MORRIS: The City of Vancouver really is different. None of the other cities are patterning their prospectus the same way the City of Vancouver is so.

BARCA: Perhaps that comes into the change of the vision on how we are going to be expecting the growth to occur then. If their perspective is based on historical values, as you stated earlier, and we're not getting the numbers out of them the way that we're looking at, then the aspect of office/business park type development into commercial lands expectations for being able to bring the numbers up in the commercial lands should perhaps be part of the vision.

MORRIS: Well, it sure needs to be a part of the discussion because obviously 12 is way too low.

PRIDEMORE: What do you think you guys can do with that by next week?

LEE: Try to do better.

PRIDEMORE: Just a matter of understanding, what is -- we've got three categories here for employment lands. One is commercial, well, commercial slash retail, business park and industrial and having a good feel for what is -- what can we expect those numbers to be in this 20-year plan would be helpful.

MORRIS: Can you segregate again the geographic area of the unincorporated Vancouver UGB? Look at just the Vancouver --

LEE: Yeah.

MORRIS: -- unincorporated Vancouver UGB --

LEE: Sure.

MORRIS: -- and see what's happening there?

PRIDEMORE: Is that fair either because that area over the next 20 years is going to increase in density just by nature of things and it's going to become more like Vancouver so that what it's been, to say that that history is the history that we'd want to use, is not necessarily any more fair than saying Vancouver.

MORRIS: I didn't say it was what we want to use, but it would be appropriate for us to take a look at what's happening in the incorporated part of that UGB and compare it to what's happening in the corporated part of the UGB. And also what's happening in commercial in say Battle Ground because you're going to get a higher number than 10 for sure in Battle Ground. I mean their commercial is almost all lots and lots of retail.

LEE: Okay.

MORRIS: And maybe we need to just segregate out retail.

PRIDEMORE: It sort of is with the business park because you really do pull out a lot of that.

STANTON: Well, it is, but then the office park is the other piece and that's where the real density comes. At least when I picture office parks they're more than one level and business park should be at one level.

PRIDEMORE: See, and I keep thinking of "business park" as being both of them. I think of business parks as being business parks and office parks I mean that they're this, that they --

STANTON: See, and I don't because the density --

PRIDEMORE: And they are different.

STANTON: -- is so different in a business park. Correct me if I'm wrong, Vaughn, but I mean my picture is in East Ridge it's a one level, spread out kind of a business park, and office campus or office park is those three- and four-story buildings that housed a lot of employees. So it seems like we need to separate out retail, office campus, business park, industrial.

SMITH: In retail you have a lot more parking, three or four times as much as a business park.

LEE: I don't know that we can do that by next week.

STANTON: No, I know it, but I've been wanting it though.

LEE: But I think that is a very germane discussion as we have that work session on the business park zone that we've talked about, et cetera, which we could fold into some of the work as we follow through on this process.

MORRIS: And I bet you East Ridge has got a much higher density than 12 too.

STANTON: They probably do.

LEE: The one constraint that we --

MORRIS: The business park manager ought to be able to tell us what their density is out there.

LEE: The one constraint that we do have is that we need to go and ask the business owners, I believe. Well, I suppose we could look at census material and see if that informs us of anything but --

MORRIS: Well, I don't think that's too -- I mean I don't think it would take too much time to pick up the phone and call. What's the business park manager's name at East Ridge?

STANTON: (Inaudible) he's on commercial.

WRISTON: Call him as an expert.

MORRIS: Yeah, I think he could get that for us pretty easily. I don't think he'd mind at all.

LEE: Some people do mind when you ask them that question.

MORRIS: Well, this is just employee. It's not anything about their business, it's just to find out how many people work there. He can do the numbers though.

LEIN: He may not know how many people work for each group.

STANTON: He may not know.

PRIDEMORE: They made it all tenants so they might not know what each of their tenants, how many employees they have.

MORRIS: You were out there, Lonnie, why don't you call and ask.

MOSS: Sure, I'll call him.

MORRIS: Just call him and say how many employees do you have in the business park, we can do the division.

BARCA: So is the goal to get us to a goal where we're going to segregate retail?

PRIDEMORE: I don't think --

LEE: Well, at this point what I have heard is you want some more information to try and make a better cut at what a more realistic density might be in terms of employees per acre on these sites.

PRIDEMORE: If we're going to cut 50 percent of the commercial, I think we want to have a good feel that that is, that is the right thing to do --

BARCA: So my concern is if commercial land is all lumped together and now we are start talking about retail versus other uses, unless we're going to go in and start segregating the commercial land itself we're cutting it too fine.

PRIDEMORE: We may need to have some of that discussion. Because like I say, the way until we had that discussion yesterday I had been thinking of business parks as being business parks and office parks and I'm thinking the same thing. But you're absolutely right. I mean the density certainly would be a whole lot different, and some of the impacts would be, so that is something we need to discuss as we develop that concept.

LEIN: How serious are we looking at mixed use where you're going to get the retail on the ground floor and living quarters above?

LEE: So the vertical mixed use?

LEIN: The vertical mixed use.

BARCA: Absolutely.

LEE: You have to tell us.

BARCA: Let's be serious then.

MORRIS: Wasn't that allowable under mixed use right now? Under the mixed use say you can do that now, can't you?

BARCA: Allowable but not a requirement.

PRIDEMORE: The bigger issue would be is are we going to do MX zoning unless something --

MORRIS: Going to do what?

PRIDEMORE: MX zoning, actually zone land MX. What's the recommendation from the Planning Commission?

WRISTON: Stay tuned.

MOSS: We'll take it under advisement.

LEIN: Well, I think we've talked a lot about mixed use and it's an opportunity to have a variety of things going on, the residential, you've got the retail, you've got commercial. You know, the Pearl's an excellent example of it right now, look at how huge that's going.

WRISTON: But you got to have the right -- you just can't jump in and do it though. I mean you don't just --

PRIDEMORE: Well, the issue with it here, the challenge is going to be, is that if we go in, we go in and we hard zone it, you're going to have some property owner there that's going to have mixed use zone who may not want to (inaudible).

WRISTON: Well, it's interesting is that Pearl is a redevelopment and it's possibly redevelopments and so then you look at your areas of redevelopment like 99.

PRIDEMORE: It's also heavily subsidized, public subsidized.

LEIN: The Housing Authority has that little development just adjacent to their new office that's going to have some of that. So either there are people out there willing to take a chance at it if the funding mechanism is in such a way that they can create a package.

PRIDEMORE: You know what we might do is if this commercial does look like this and we do talk about cutting, you know, 40, 50 percent of what we've been planning on maybe we say, you know, that's what we experiment with is that differences, we hard zone that as MX and recognize that those folks, you know, it was going to be MX or you weren't going to get anything because we were going to cut that in half.

WRISTON: You might want to get -- you just want to go slow, not too slow, but I mean and maybe look at redevelopment areas as some of those areas that are get more bang for your buck. And plus you can get probably more subsidies and more grants and things like that, but some redevelopment. We've got some redevelopment areas that rather than just saying, okay, this is going to be vacant buildable lands and we're going to zone, this a mixed use area.

STANTON: We might see some of it come with 134th with the Salmon Creek Corridor and reaching capacity and still wanting more residential because mixed use is allowable in that held aside 500 trips too.

MOSS: Yeah, I have some apprehensions about what you suggested though, Craig, in putting it out on the fringe of the urban growth boundary and I'm not sure that that's the appropriate place for it.

PRIDEMORE: I didn't mean to suggest that location earlier. I guess it is implied by --

MOSS: No. I was thinking any urban growth expansion that we had, though, is it's going to be out there.

PRIDEMORE: Well, it would be important, I mean, to make it easier because you're talking about -- if we get at the inside you're talking about rezoning and having willing participants in, that would sure make that a lot smoother.

MOSS: Yeah, but it also depends on whether we take a mandatory or permissive approach on the zoning too.

PRIDEMORE: And Hazel Dell's a perfect place for it.

MORRIS: I think Hazel Dell's a perfect place for it too. And I'm thinking of some people who are zoned high density who would love to be mixed use because then you could take part of those and put them all together as a mixed use. All of a sudden they've got a lot more opportunity to --

PRIDEMORE: And there are some places I think specifically with Ratermann. I mean that's exactly why I was not real keen on rezoning that. But would they be interested in doing the vertical mixed use, you know, where you've actually got housing on top?

MORRIS: You know, I don't have any idea. I got to tell you I've never seen a vertical new one that high.

WRISTON: Do you put apartments on top of your building.

MORRIS: So I mean I'm not a (inaudible) of mixed use, I'd have to be persuaded about that, but I don't see any reason why you can't do mixed use. Or if somebody wants to come in with a vertical mixed use because they don't have a lot of acreage to work with, why couldn't they.

BARCA: Well, I think it's just the opposite as we should be actually encouraging them to because it gives a better utilization of the land and doubles up for us on the benefits for the already existing infrastructure.

PRIDEMORE: But it's just that most people don't voluntarily bring these things forward, they usually end up being the public subsidized and --

MORRIS: Yeah, you have to encourage the private sector too if they think they're going to get the money out of it.

PRIDEMORE: And there's not a whole lot we're willing to experiment with.

LEIN: Gramor's doing a lot of it right now in Oregon. They're doing a ton of that stuff down in Lake Oswego and on the west side. You know, it tends not to want to go out and be out in Orchards necessarily, it goes into the larger density areas, but I think it's an opportunity that more people will start doing. You know, you've seen it down in Downtown Vancouver here. You know, Angelo did there, that's a mixed use.

PRIDEMORE: Gramor is I think doing it on the Interstate light rail too.

WRISTON: You're talking about Angelo downtown there?

LEIN: Yeah.

WRISTON: He's having a tough time though, I think. Or he was.

MORRIS: Orenco, yeah, he is.

WRISTON: I don't know. No, well --

LEIN: Down by the park.

MOSS: I think if we offer the opportunity here, there are going to be successes and those will bring other successes. I'm a little concerned about making it mandatory in any zone, although I kind of like your idea other than it's out on the fringe that you have an opportunity for it.

LEIN: So you have that option.

MOSS: Yeah, I think if it's offered.

LEIN: You can't make it so (inaudible) that they have to re-invent them to go through it.

PRIDEMORE: I think you need to have an encouragement program along with an overlay or it doesn't occur. I mean we got as far as we could get with Hazel Dell Town Center, which was the exact circumstance, we did the overlay but they didn't want to build.

MOSS: You mean encouragement in the form of just job (inaudible) the successes elsewhere or do you mean public subsidies?

PRIDEMORE: No. I think you'd have to do some form of subsidy. And whether that's, you know, where you bring in the expedited permitting process or we do some of that, the economic development REET or some other thing, that helps encourage somebody to want to do that, but if it's just an overlay so far nobody's done that. Uptown Village, even the stuff Corky has done have been heavily subsidized and the success is (inaudible) station.

MOSS: If you have to heavily subsidize these I guess I would question why we would want to do it at all. I mean we're interested in creating jobs and creating development, but I'm not interested if we've got to --

WRISTON: To get it going.

MOSS: Well, to get it going is --

WRISTON: Once it goes it --

MOSS: Sure.

MORRIS: Listen, we don't have the money to subsidize.

PRIDEMORE: But we have process stuff we could use.

MOSS: Why don't we do the long-term economic strategy.

MORRIS: But it seems to me that it's as much a question of having huge areas that are zoned mixed use. Like you run mixed use from 63rd to --

PRIDEMORE: 78th.

MORRIS: Well, no, you run it to 134th.

PRIDEMORE: The whole thing?

MORRIS: It's all mixed use and then people can combine and put their developments together however they want to but --

MOSS: I think that's an ideal place for it.

MORRIS: I think it's a real ideal place for it.

PRIDEMORE: That's where they experimented with in '94. And my only thing with it is where you get mixed use defined on a larger geographic area which says we've got some apartments here and we've got a store here, therefore we have mixed use, that's different than what we're talking about when you're talking about vertical mixed use which is the housing and the commercial are really integrated with each other.

MORRIS: But mixed use is also what you're going to see out at the Ridgefield Junction, so if you have large areas that are mixed use zoned and they combine and they put their mixed uses together any way that they want to so that any development application that comes through in a mixed use zone has to show a mix of uses.

PRIDEMORE: But that's the issue, though, is how do you define "mixed use." Do you define "mixed use" as being the way you're defining it, which is the more flexible way I suppose, or do you define it like The Heritage Place Condominiums as to what some people define "mixed use" as being more like that.

MORRIS: And that's the one you've got to subsidize a lot more than you do the other one.

PRIDEMORE: Exactly.

MORRIS: So from my perspective I like the other way.

LEIN: Well, the other aspect about it is the family wage. So many of those establishments may not fall into any kind of the wage bracket.

PRIDEMORE: But you could have the Uptown Village will have on their lower floors their offices, those could be attorneys' offices, what have you, so I mean they can.

PRIDEMORE: Well, a good discussion for us to keep in mind. We're at 9:35. I love this stuff, I mean we can go on on any of it. What's the desire of --

LEIN: Pat, do you have enough direction on other things?

LEE: Well, tell me if I have enough direction. Here's kind of my notes. Sort of playing off of the economic development discussion that we had, Betty Sue, you raised a question about that industrial land absorption figure on Page 111, Number 35, regarding the rate of absorption in Vancouver of industrial lands, so we'll look into that. Craig, I think under the FPIA discussion you were looking what the FPIAs didn't do was, you know, break out 100-acre parcels as and you'd like that as a do assort, see how --

PRIDEMORE: I think I said 75 because that's what our economic development strategy said was --

LEE: So 75.

PRIDEMORE: -- some sort of magic marker.

LEE: So 75 plus acre parcels, trying to assort that would give us what that might be.

PRIDEMORE: Where even if you had like a 25 and a 50 right next to each other, I don't know, it seems to me you started thinking after I said it was you don't have to have an entire 75-acre block if you have 75 acres of contiguous large lots that are the aggregation of them is not prohibitive. And I don't know where that line's drawn so maybe I just want to withdraw the request and --

MORRIS: Simplifies Pat's life.

LEE: We'll keep it in mind if we have spare time, how's that. Chase down the history of industrial nodes, this was Jeff's comments, trying to figure out if there was some sort of priority attention given to three or some finite number back in '94. And if so, how have things gone since then.

MORRIS: And we know there were because you say so on Page 6.

LEE: Well, there was an industrial nodes discussion that throughout whether it was priority in the sense that we're talking about FPIAs I don't know.

PRIDEMORE: I think they just told Jeff that.

LEE: I think we need to do some work on Table A-6 and the FPIA report which the headings people may not intuitively understand what the numbers represent, so we need to work out those problems there. Under the revenue forecast we just want to confirm how we did or did not address the nickel issue. I think you have a pretty good sense of how it is, but we'll confirm that. Under the decision factors question regarding the 38 percent infrastructure did that include schools, fire stations, other public facilities. And also we need to take a look at trying to get a better sense of the employment densities we're seeing in commercial retail within Vancouver, we know Vancouver's working on that, in the Vancouver UGA outside of the city limits and possibly in Battle Ground as another try and get some samples that we can present information on. And reconciled build-out numbers in the DEIS with those in the staff report, try and figure out what the distinctions and differences are between those.

And the only other thing that I'm a little fuzzy where we left it is applying the list of criteria in terms of locational factors, strategic factors that CREDC had presented. Did you want us to try and get in touch with some commercial real estate folks to give us a sense of that? I'm not sure I got clear direction on that one so if you could clarify, I'd appreciate it.

MORRIS: The question is how important is it to overlay those in our priority, prioritization. I mean they're pretty clear they like stuff that's along an Interstate.

PRIDEMORE: And that's probably, and it's not -- it's not in so many different areas that we couldn't look at the dollar things and apply CREDC's criteria ourselves specifically.

STANTON: Forget it.

LEE: Okay. That's the info list that I captured.

PRIDEMORE: On the infrastructure deductions, just to clarify, it's slightly broader, just the methodology used because the issues about are we talking about this is how it is in downtown Vancouver or this is how it is out at Fisher's Landing, what areas did we look at. The basic idea is is that at the end of whatever presentation comes out of that, all of us would have a pretty good sense about what is the right number to use for the infrastructure deduction.

MORRIS: And what do you get in the Vancouver, again in the unincorporated Vancouver UGB for infrastructure. And you're also going to reconcile the difference in actual capacity between Page 102 and this memo. And if you need -- I probably need to explain that more explicitly to you.

PRIDEMORE: Any comments? Anything else here that I'm supposed to talk specifically on?

BARCA: Before we adjourn, the rest of the process as I know it right now is we're meeting again next week, then you're picking this up on the 23rd. Is that the end of the involvement for us in Planning Commission?

PRIDEMORE: At this stage.

MORRIS: For a while.

PRIDEMORE: And then when it comes back forward for the final plan, it will go through a full hearing process with you guys before coming to us.

BARCA: So when we see it again, it will be a single alternative?

MORRIS: Yes.

STANTON: With the completed EIS.

PRIDEMORE: Yeah. I mean I think the way I look at it at least, and do correct, is that we'll come up with this preferred alternative and the remainder of the process is finalizing capital facilities plan and tweaking where it needs to be. You know, I mean there's not, you know, the preferred alternative is not the final plan, but it's where this is what we're going to work from from this point on, make some adjustments to that. Okay. With there being nothing else, we stand adjourned.

ADJOURMENT

The hearing adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Craig Pridemore, Chair	Vaughn Lein, Chair
Clark County Board of Commissioners	Clark County Planning Commission

Minutes Transcribed By:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter
Sonja Wiser, Administrative Assistant

SW\PC-BOCC 6-12-03